

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 485

JC 671 003

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND THE CHURCHES.
BY- TILLERY, DALE AND OTHERS

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$3.00 73P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *CHURCH ROLE, *SOCIAL VALUES, VALUES, MORAL VALUES, CHURCH RESPONSIBILITY, CHURCH RELATED COLLEGES, INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION,

JOHN H. PORTERFIELD ADDRESSED THE CONFERENCE ON RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND THE CHURCHES BY POINTING OUT THE PLACE OF EDUCATION IN SHAPING TODAY'S MORAL VALUES AND THE PARALLEL GOALS OF CHURCH AND SCHOOL IN DEVELOPING THE STUDENT AS A WHOLE PERSON FOR HIS ROLE IN A SOCIETY IN CONSTANT NEED OF RENEWAL. WILLIAM H. LOVELL COMMENTED ON THE SHARED CONCERN OF CHURCH AND COLLEGE IN SUCH SOCIAL FUNCTIONS AS THE EDUCATION OF THE CULTURALLY DEPRIVED AND ADDED THAT THE CHURCHES COULD ALSO RAISE THE STANDARD OF INTELLECTUAL INQUIRY AND SCHOLARSHIP IN THEIR OWN SCHOOLS. DALE TILLERY'S STUDY DOCUMENT COVERED MANY ISSUES FACING THE CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE--ITS LINKS WITH BOTH THE SECONDARY AND HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEMS, THE DEBATE BETWEEN ADVOCATES OF VOCATIONAL AND ACADEMIC PROGRAMS, THE QUESTIONS OF WHO IS TO BE EDUCATED, WHAT AND HOW THEY SHOULD BE TAUGHT, WHO IS TO PAY FOR THE COLLEGE, HOW THE COST IS TO BE SHARED, AND WHO IS TO GOVERN, THE ROLE OF PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS, AND THE RELATIONSHIP WITH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS. HE FELT THAT THE COLLEGE AS AN INSTITUTION SHOULD BE JUDGED BY WHAT IT IS ABLE TO DO WITH THE STUDENTS IT ACCEPTS RATHER THAN BY ITS ABILITY TO ATTRACT TALENTED ONES. THESE PAPERS WERE PRESENTED AT A CONFERENCE ON RELATIONSHIPS (PACIFIC GROVE, CALIFORNIA, FEBRUARY 17-18, 1966). (HH)

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION

A Study Document By

Dr. Dale Tillery

Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California

for

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND THE CHURCHES

"A Conference on Relationships"

Asilomar, Pacific Grove, California

February 17-18, 1966

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

DEC 15 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGE EDUCATION

Dr. Dale Tillery

Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California

INTRODUCTION

The sprawling complex of American institutions which offer education beyond the high school is slowly being shaped into state systems of higher education. These proto-systems lack the central governance and clarity of purposes which characterize most national systems of advanced education. It is little wonder, therefore, that foreign visitors who come to study our experiments in higher education are confused by the diversity of our purposes and of our institutions. But those of us at home are confused too, particularly when we hear about colleges, programs, and students who differ from our own cherished traditions about what is collegiate and about who ought to be educated beyond the high school.

The confusion, and, perhaps, disillusionment, does not diminish when we are assured that the growth of enrollments, diversity of standards, and curricula, and heterogeneity of student bodies are faithful reflections of our burgeoning, pluralistic society.

To be sure, no segment of American institutions has kept closer pace with the American technical and social revolutions than have the colleges and universities, which furnish the necessary talents and leadership. It is these institutions which most accurately reflect the American dream of opportunity for each individual to develop his full capacities regardless of handicaps or humble beginnings. This dream has always influenced American higher education, but at no time more than the present decade. The advocates of elite education have always resisted the demands of the common man for higher education, the doors of opportunity have opened wider, decade by decade. This democratization of our colleges has often meant the creation of new types of institutions to do the job. The list of such innovations is impressive: the small denominational colleges, the normal schools and later teacher colleges, the evening colleges and extension centers, the land-grant colleges, and finally the community junior colleges. Each of these new institutions has opened the door wider.

It is understandable, then, why this newest of our collegiate institutions is called the open door college and the people's college. New it is, but the roots of the junior college go deep into the soil of American aspirations and traditions. Perhaps this is why this institution which is still struggling for identity has been challenged in our time to play such a major role in educating the youth of all the people.

The junior college is not only American in its heritage, but also in its diversity and in the way it grows from local initiative and

resources. It is these very strengths which make the junior colleges hard to understand, and perhaps hard to fit neatly into emerging state systems of higher education with their planned diversity of programs and student bodies.

The junior college is most fully developed in California, but many states are now competing for distinctions in quality of college programs, methods of financial support, and coordination of state-wide systems of two-year institutions. It is likely, however, that many of the issues which characterize California junior college education in our decade are, or will be important in most states of the nation. An examination of these issues is the best way of understanding the community junior college. The discussion which follows reveals the strengths and weaknesses of this remarkable institution, which promises to be the very foundation of our new systems of higher education.

THE ISSUES*

As Junior College education enters its second half century in California, it gains new status, new resources, and new problems. The seventy-five colleges which compose this loosely affiliated system of post-secondary education are in a period of great transition. They face the problems which beset all higher education in an age of social and technical revolutions -- only more so. Approximately 40% of all full-time students in California public higher education and 70% of full-time freshmen and sophomores are in Junior College classrooms which they share with over 300,000 part-time students. With rapid growth many of the nearly 7,000 teachers are new to Junior Colleges with no firm commitment to the goals of an institution with which they have had only limited experience. And the problems of increase in staff are intensified by the new authority which Junior College teachers have demanded and achieved. The establishing and functioning of academic senates suggest new stresses as well as strengths for college management and for those who make policy.

The internal changes in structure and authority have counterparts in the statewide governmental agencies and professional associations which seek to give direction to Junior College education. The colleges are still enmeshed in the rules and regulations of the secondary schools at a time when they have been brought into the family of higher education by a master plan seeking to coordinate and develop the several segments of higher education. In addition, the Junior Colleges are served by a State Board and a Department of Education which, in the most populous

* The balance of this paper was prepared for the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education, and was published in "A Consideration of Issues Affecting California Public Junior Colleges."

and educationally ambitious state of the nation, must concern themselves with kindergarten through Junior College education.

Officials who seek to husband State resources and plan the development of a diversified system of higher education for California are frequently baffled by the dispersion of Junior College authority. With 66 governing boards and a half-dozen associations involved in determining and influencing educational policy, the question -- "Who speaks for the Junior Colleges?" -- is frequently asked. When statewide trustees or commissioners are proposed as a means of bringing order out of diversity, many Junior College leaders argue that centralization is anathema to the community college concept and that the very diversity criticized by State planners is the source of Junior College strength and uniqueness.

But the special qualities of the comprehensive community college are being both threatened and promoted by numerous influences. For example, the national programs of support for technical-vocational education and for attacking the problems of the educationally disadvantaged may counterbalance recent trends toward traditional academic orientations in curriculum and teaching. The resulting debate, conflict, and experimentation could give new vigor to Junior College education and help reaffirm its identity.

California is covered with handsome new two-year college campuses, many of them models of college planning for the rest of the nation; and at least 30 additional new colleges are to be built by 1970. The costs of this capital development have been carried by local communities until recently. However, in 1963 the Legislature declared that the costs of Junior College education were to be shared by the State and local communities. They proceeded, then, to appropriate \$20,000,000 for capital outlay purposes. Recently, the voters of California approved a measure which would provide an additional \$50,000,000 for Junior College construction. For current costs the State will apportion more than \$48,000,000 in fiscal 1964-65 to Junior Colleges, but nearly three times this amount will come from local taxes. Although it has not yet been achieved, there appear to be no insurmountable barriers to achieving a near 50-50 sharing of Junior College costs between the two levels of government.

By their history and by their legal mandate California Junior Colleges are to complement not mimic the other segments of higher education. Such diversity among equals recognizes certain overlapping in the qualifications of students served and the nature of programs offered by the Junior Colleges, California State Colleges, and the University of California. But the Junior Colleges are particularly charged with providing services and programs not offered by the other levels of higher education and to educate a more heterogeneous student body. The will, the resources, and the teaching talents are at present only partially available to meet the charge. The lack in any of these factors can be translated into students without educational opportunity. In this sense the issues which emerge from this report on California Junior Colleges beg a fundamental question: Who shall be educated?

IMPLICATIONS OF THE PAST

A sketch of California Junior College history should emphasize only those events and influences which have given rise to present issues in Junior College education. Most of these issues were anticipated by men who spoke for this new institution at the turn of the century and during its subsequent development. To be more precise such leaders as Lange, Jordan, McLane, and Snyder among others helped shape these issues since they were participants in America's innovation in higher education. It is fitting, then, to sketch the historic factors which seem to underline the contemporary issues.

WHO SHALL BE TAUGHT?

There has long been debate about the intention of the first Junior College enabling law in California, the Caminetti Bill of 1907. This legislation grew out of the increasing practice of permitting students to return to high school after graduation. Students returned to make up deficiencies for college entrance, to achieve advance standing in college, and to gain greater vocational proficiency. To be sure the bill provided that courses of study "shall approximate the studies prescribed in the first two years of university courses." Lest we forget, however, the University of California's own practical and service programs as a land grant college made it quite acceptable for the first California Junior College to offer both academic and vocational courses. In advocating the establishment of Fresno Junior College in 1910, Superintendent Charles McLane urged that the college offer courses in "agriculture, manual training, domestic science, and other technical work in addition to regular academic courses." It was the University's own spokesman, Alexis F. Lange, who commended Fresno for providing opportunities for higher vocational training. And in particular, Dean Lange joined with McLane and the other high school leaders who developed early Junior Colleges in advocating post-high school education for those who could not afford, or who were not ready or interested in attending the universities.

These were the beginnings, then, of the people's college. Although the impetus and philosophy were there for broad curricula, the resources were not. The Laws of 1917 and 1921 and subsequent acts of the California Legislature encouraged the courses which were to be increasingly relevant to all segments of California society. In addition to expanding vocational-technical programs, new emphasis was given to guidance and to remedial, general, and adult education. It was this complex of Junior College programs and services which was reaffirmed by the major surveys of California higher education following World War II, culminating in the Master Plan for Higher Education which brought the Junior Colleges firmly into the folds of higher education. Thus, today, while the other segments of the State system are to be differentially selective, the Junior Colleges are to serve all who can profit from this wide range of instruction. This by definition, therefore, includes all high school graduates. The consequence in 1965 is that California approaches the recent recommendation of the Educational Policies Commission of the

National Education Association for universal opportunity for education beyond the high school. As it does so, however, there is new sharpness to the questions: Are courses which are relevant to the less able and less motivated Junior College students actually of college level? Can we get teachers who are able and willing to teach students with such a wide range of abilities and interests? Can California afford the costs of providing some college education for most of its citizens?

WHAT IS THE JUNIOR COLLEGE ROLE?

The doubts about the identity of Junior Colleges have not been put to rest in spite of Master Plan declarations and Junior College assertions. History sheds considerable light on this lingering ambivalence about Junior College education, but it is not enough to show that in the beginning the two-year colleges were deeply rooted in the secondary school system from which they gained their leadership, resources, and legal identity. Of equal importance is the theoretical basis for this union which was clearer in an age when secondary education was less drastically separated from higher education. For those who conceived and supported the Junior College there was a natural union between the last two years of high school and the first two years of college. David Starr Jordan of Stanford gave full sweep to the concept of the bifurcated university, advocated by Michigan's Tappan and Chicago's Harper, by urging that American universities abandon their Junior College functions. About the same time, 1908, Lange argued that the freshmen and sophomore years in universities were "mere continuation of secondary education under poorer teachers, very likely." He went on to say that since it was impossible to bring the University within "walking distance of every doorstep," the University should "reduce its swollen fortune in freshmen and sophomores" by actively promoting their distribution among other institutions. In particular, educational opportunities could be extended by adding two years to the existing four-year high schools.

The call for differentiation and even separation of the thirteenth and fourteenth years from the high schools is a counter force in the development of California Junior Colleges. As early as 1915 a University of California publication, *The Junior Colleges in California*, stated,

"It is clearly desirable that ... the junior college courses should be organized and conducted on a collegiate as distinguished from a high school basis. In general, it is clearly desirable that such courses should be regarded as more advanced, should employ methods implying greater maturity, should be in a word, beyond the powers of high school students."

With the ever-increasing number of transfer students in Junior Colleges the University's demands for "parallelism" in course standards grew stronger and were instrumental in shaping the collegiate orientation of contemporary Junior Colleges.

It seems likely that the expanding programs and services which characterized the two-year "capstones" to California high schools in

the thirties and post-war period were the most important factors in separating Junior Colleges from secondary education. The Legislature became increasingly insistent that funds earmarked for Junior College education be used only for that purpose by school districts, and it finally encouraged and then mandated the development of independent Junior College districts. The Junior Colleges, however, remained part of the public school system and were legally identified as secondary education. It is only with the Donahoe Higher Education Act of 1960 that the Junior Colleges of California were designated as one of three segments of public higher education. Nevertheless, the statutory and administrative regulations which associated the two-year colleges with secondary education remain operative; and the institution's identity was further confused when the Legislature in 1963, in a mood of expediency, once again defined the Junior Colleges as part of secondary education in order to insure continued flow of funds from the National Defense Education Act.

It is unlikely that the existing confusion in identity can be erased by legislative mandate. The heart of the matter is the changing nature of higher education in American society. Within this context, the Junior Colleges are playing an important role in the continuous process of defining higher education. The relevant issue in 1965 is whether they can preserve, let alone enhance, their uniqueness in partnership with four-year colleges and universities.

HOW SHALL CALIFORNIA JUNIOR COLLEGES BE GOVERNED?

The Junior Colleges of California have grown from the energies, aspirations, and resources of local communities. Early legislation provided little guidance, but also few restrictions, to individual high school boards of trustees in establishing and managing the first Junior Colleges. The State clearly reserved to itself, however, the right to determine the conditions under which Junior Colleges might be formed, the programs which they might offer, and the means by which they could be financed. But, to this day the determination of local citizens and their initiative are essential to the establishment of Junior College services.

Nevertheless, the distribution of authority in the governance of Junior Colleges was always complex and has become increasingly so as the colleges have grown in number, complexity, and influence. Since 1907 legislative acts and State Board of Education regulations have established an increasingly detailed framework within which local trustees determine policy. Today there exists a baffling array of mandates and provisions sprinkled throughout the Education Code and Title 5 of the Administrative Code for governing Junior Colleges. Moreover, no less than fifteen State departments and agencies serve or make demands on the Junior Colleges.

While this pluralism of authority has complicated the lives of administrators and those who engage in long-term planning for the coordination of California higher education, it has insured the primacy of local authority in Junior College governance.

In the first half of the century remarkable sharing of experiences and problems through formal and informal associations contributed both to the vitality of the Junior Colleges and to securing supportive legislation. But pluralism meant many voices, and localism became a barrier to the establishment of statewide plans for Junior College development. Consequently, with the pressing problems of finance, enrollments, and coordination during the post-war years, piecemeal legislation was produced affecting Junior Colleges in response to both new and conflicting voices throughout the State. Not the least of these new voices were those of faculty groups seeking a new role in recommending educational policy.

To be sure this pattern of decision without study and legislation without plan, was characteristic of the way many states responded to staggering demands for higher education in the fifties. California, however, began a series of studies of higher education which culminated in the Master Plan of 1960. The resulting efforts to coordinate the growth, finance, and functions of the various segments of higher education focused sharp attention of the diffuse State responsibilities vis-a-vis the Junior Colleges and the diversity in the governance of these institutions, in contrast to the relatively centralized control of the State College and University systems. Today key questions are being asked: Should the splintered services and authority of State agencies be centralized into an agency authorized to recommend comprehensive policy for California's Junior Colleges? Would a separate State governing board for Junior Colleges enhance or stifle the ability of local colleges to serve the majority of youth seeking admission to college? Are pluralism in authority and diversity in practice strengths in the governance of collegiate institutions which are undervalued by those who struggled with the monumental tasks of coordination and finance? How can the community college be strengthened within a statewide program of rational planning and use of resources?

WHO WILL PAY THE BILL?

It was clearly the intent of early legislation to make Junior Colleges part of the free public school system of the State and to prescribe the formulae by which local communities might raise funds to do the job. Furthermore, constitutional protection of the State School Fund provided a continuity of State support. The growing number of colleges benefited by the State's concern for minimum standards for all public education and the consequent rise in foundation programs and measures to equalize the differing abilities of local communities to pay the bill. Nevertheless, it has been the local taxpayer who has carried the major share of the cost of educating Junior College students. On a statewide basis school districts have been paying recently approximately 70-75% of Junior College costs.

As early as 1932 a study of higher education, the "Suzzallo Report", recommended that the State should pay half the costs of educating Junior College students. Yet, this was before the great building programs of the past two decades. Actually, until the Junior College Tax Relief Act of 1961 the State paid nothing for Junior College construction.

Today, however, with its new responsibilities in higher education the Junior Colleges are seeking and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education has recommended continuing State responsibility for 40-45% of average construction costs. Bonding propositions in 1962 and 1964 indicate readiness on the part of the Legislature to fulfill its financial commitments to the Junior College under the Donahoe Act of 1960. When combined with the Higher Education Facilities Act of the Federal Government, these State efforts promise significant relief to local communities in paying the costs of Junior College education.

The issue of who will pay for Junior College education has always been intertwined with questions about who will be educated by these colleges and who will govern them. As the balance of support begins to shift, these questions take on a new importance. Should students pay part of the cost of Junior College education through fees for student services or even tuition? If so, would such fees eliminate students who are in greatest need of this level of education? If the State assumes an increasing share of the costs should it not have more to say about the objectives of Junior Colleges and how they are managed?

"THE BIG SHIFT TO JUNIOR COLLEGES"

The post-war years in general and the present decade in particular represent periods of remarkable growth for Junior Colleges in California. Table 1 shows the relative growth of Junior College enrollments when compared with the other segments of California higher education and includes projected enrollments through 1975.

TABLE 1
Full-Time Enrollments in California Higher Education *

Year	Junior Colleges	State Colleges	UC	Private	Total
1945	17,408	6,851	18,400	19,661	62,318
1950	56,622	25,369	39,492	41,036	162,521
1955	70,165	33,910	37,035	40,003	181,113
1960	99,783	56,480	46,801	53,785	257,725
1961	112,636	64,099	51,340	57,220	286,228
1962	121,283	71,502	55,775	61,234	310,888
1963	128,221	80,188	61,073	61,618	332,339
1964	152,401	92,454	67,070	64,000	375,425

PROJECTIONS

1965	172,150	95,000	78,025	68,500	413,675
1970	216,200	134,475	105,150	81,800	537,625
1975	267,100	166,325	125,300	91,100	649,825

* The data prior to 1960 are from A Study of the Needs for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California; those from 1960-1964 are from reports of total and full-time enrollments as prepared by the Department of Finance. Projections are from CCHE, California's Needs for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education, #1014 (Sacramento, December 1964), p. 17.

The Junior Colleges enrolled approximately 411,000 students of which at least 152,000 were full-time in the fall of 1964, illustrating the magnitude of "The Big Shift to Junior Colleges," the caption used by the San Francisco Chronicle in reporting preliminary 1964 registration figures for the three segments of public higher education in California.

Such a shift was encouraged by the Master Plan with its proposals for the diversion of lower-division students to the Junior College system. As a result of such diversion it was expected that Junior College enrollments would grow by about 225% from 1958 to 1975. However, as will be pointed out, neither the University of California nor the State Colleges have, to date, successfully promoted the diversion of students to Junior Colleges.

In examining the problem of numbers in Junior College education it is misleading to report only full-time enrollments. Whereas only about 5% of University students and 40% of State College students are registered for less than 12 units, nearly 70% of Junior College students are so defined as part-time students. Assuming a status quo ratio of part-time to full-time students as indicated by fall 1963 enrollments, it is likely that nearly 1,000,000 students will be attending Junior

TABLE 2
Projected Full and Part-Time Enrollments
in California Junior Colleges *

Year	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total
1963	128,221	305,586	433,807
1965	172,150	409,439	581,589
1970	216,200	514,205	730,405
1975	267,100	635,265	902,365

* These figures based on a 70.4/29.6 part-time to full-time ratio derived from 1963 data.

Colleges by 1975. Table 2 shows this projection of total enrollments based upon projections for full-time students.

DISTRIBUTION OF COLLEGES

The recent growth in Junior College enrollments represents concerted efforts by State and local officials to provide more equitable post-high school education for citizens from all parts of the state. This has not always been the case since Junior College development has, until recently, lacked any kind of State plan. Local communities have had different commitments, as well as resources in providing Junior College education for their citizens. As recently as 1957 it was possible for the following statement to be made in A Study of the Need for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education in California:

Junior Colleges are local institutions which are distributed somewhat unevenly throughout the state, and there are a number of areas of the state where additional junior college facilities are needed and where the local assessed valuation is sufficient to support them. Had the institutions needed been well established, it is estimated that 1955 enrollments would have included an additional 11,500 full-time students.¹

¹ Sacramento: State Board of Education, 1957, p. 25.

This inequity can be illustrated more sharply by noting that in the fall 1955, whereas San Francisco County had 55.4% of its high school graduates of the two preceding years enrolled as Junior College students, Alameda County -- without adequate Junior College coverage -- enrolled only 17.4% of the graduates. This dramatic difference is consistent with more recent investigations which show that higher percentage of high school graduates attend college when there is a local Junior College available than when other types of institutions or no institutions serve an area. Furthermore, even in metropolitan communities college attendance varies inversely as the distance from Junior College campuses.

The Master Plan identified 21 areas of the state which needed Junior College service. By mid-1964 action had been taken in all of these areas to provide local Junior College service either by annexation to existing Junior College districts or by the formation of new ones. Four districts not anticipated by the Master Plan have also been formed. As a result of this development approximately 80% of all high school graduates are in districts served by local Junior Colleges. On the other hand 35,614 high school graduates still were not in such districts as of April 1964. Studies concerned with the establishment of new districts or annexation to existing districts are under way, and it is likely that by 1966 only the most remote and sparsely populated areas of California will remain outside Junior College districts.

FLOW OF STUDENTS

Before discussing the implications of growth in size and number of Junior Colleges, it should be noted that a reasonable enrollment balance among the three segments of public higher education is developing. The long history of articulation among these institutions and the major studies upon which California's Master Plan rests all call for ready access to Junior Colleges by citizens in all communities of the state. The proper functioning of the State Colleges and the University of California are closely related to the flow of students from the two-year colleges. This flow includes students who, although eligible for admission to a four-year institution, find it wise or necessary to attend Junior Colleges first, and an even larger number of students who earn their eligibility to enter the four-year colleges as a result of successful Junior College work. In 1959, 56.4% of California's high school graduates were ineligible to enter the other two segments of public higher education. Under provisions of the Master Plan this percentage should increase to some 63% by fall 1965.

The ratios of high school graduates eligible for admission to the State Colleges and to the University are misleading. It is important to note that the University draws only about one-third of the 12½% of high school graduates who are considered eligible for admission. In turn the State Colleges enroll only one-fifth of the approximately 40% of the graduates who are presently eligible for admission. (In fall 1965 the percentage eligible will drop to 33 1/3%.) A 1962 study by the Department of Education confirms the impression that many of these

"eligible" students do select Junior Colleges for first admission. Approximately 5% of the 1962 Junior College freshmen were eligible to enter the University and approximately 33% to enter State Colleges. Another way of looking at this matter of choice is to note the percentage of eligible students who chose Junior Colleges. Nearly 20% of University-eligible students in 1961 attended Junior Colleges. Although comparable data are not available for the graduates eligible to enter State Colleges, it is likely that a considerably higher percentage of these students attend Junior Colleges.

SUMMARY

There is considerable misinformation abroad about the percentage of California high school graduates who attend college. The most recent report from the United State Office of Education indicates that over three-fourths of all California's graduates enter some college. It is likely that this finding does not take into consideration the large migration of college-age youth into California nor the large number of older students who enter college for the first time. In any case this estimate of college-going is much higher than that reported by the State Department of Finance. In 1961 it was estimated that 52% of high school graduates of that year entered some college in and out of California. The distribution of these students among the several institutions is shown in Table 3. This would seem to be a valid picture of college going among California high school graduates. It also indicates the upward trend in the percentage of graduates entering college as predicted by the Master Plan studies.

TABLE 3

Percentage of 1961 Graduates of California Public High Schools Who Entered Institutions of Higher Education

<i>Institution</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
University of California	5%
California State Colleges	8%
California Junior Colleges	32%
California Private Colleges or Universities	5%
Out-of-State Colleges or Universities	2%
Total	52%

As was suggested earlier, new concerns for keeping youngsters in school and providing more and better education for employment should increase the percentage of students who finish high school and seek post-high school education. It is likely that a large number of these students will choose Junior Colleges. It may be, then, that the 50,000 students who are to be diverted from the State Colleges and the University of California under provisions of the Master Plan will represent a relatively small share of the increasing burden on California Junior Colleges. The unknown dimension of such new responsibilities is only one indication of the urgent need for intensive and longitudinal studies of college going in California.

JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENTS

It is meaningless to talk about "the Junior College student" as if he had characteristics which set him apart from other college students. In fact the one thing that most typifies Junior College student bodies is their heterogeneity. There are always wide ranges of abilities, interests, backgrounds, and motivations. In California this diversity results primarily from the comprehensive services and curricula of the Junior Colleges. As non-selective colleges they not only provide education for students who do not seek or are not able to transfer to a four-year institution, but they attract a high percentage of those students who are fully qualified to enter the University and the State Colleges. Although certain data will be reported on the "typical" Junior College student as determined by statistical averages, the findings may be misleading. It seems important, therefore, to be aware of the differences among the colleges and of various sub-groups within a single campus. For example, some of the characteristics discussed below will be influenced by the fact that only about 30% of the full-time and part-time enrollments at Junior Colleges in recent years have been women. This large ratio of men to women has implications for data on measured aptitude, educational aspiration, and most other characteristics.

ABILITY AND PRIOR PERFORMANCE

An examination of several recent institutional studies would suggest that a 1953 California study of 13 Junior Colleges and the diversity studies at the Center for the Study of Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley were still valid in describing the academic aptitude of Junior College students. The full range of aptitudes, as measured by standard tests, is found in Junior College student bodies; and these colleges tend to attract almost equally from the quartiles of ability levels. In general the mean test scores for Junior College freshmen is somewhat lower than that for the four-year institutions. However, as would be expected, the overlap within the two types of institutions is great. Furthermore, within each segment of California higher education there are differences in mean aptitude scores for individual colleges. This is true for campuses of the University, the State Colleges, as well as Junior Colleges.

Although no adequate study has been made of the distribution of academic aptitude among the California institutions, it is quite apparent that the mean aptitude levels of the three segments of public higher education reflect the differential admission standards of the institutions. On the other hand there is evidence from the Berkeley studies that some Junior Colleges have mean scores which equal or exceed the mean scores of some State Colleges. This may be due, in part, to the differences in programs found at the various Junior Colleges. It is not surprising that students of varying academic aptitude distribute themselves differently among the several programs offered by the Junior Colleges. In general, the students who declare transfer objectives have

considerably higher mean scores than those in terminal programs. Among the numerous non-transfer programs, however, there are marked differences in student aptitude: The more selective technical fields, for example, attract students whose academic aptitude is superior to that of most students in a number of transfer majors. Although there are no complete California data, it would appear that Medsker's analysis of ability levels in various curricular fields is valid. He pointed out that "those curricula which attract high-ability transfer students also attract high-ability terminal students and vice versa."

Low Ability Students. A major concern in Junior College education is finding ways of providing meaningful education for low-ability students. Berg has suggested in a recent study that about 10% of Junior College day students might be identified as low ability students, however, his sample fell within the 16-30 percentile range on the School and College Aptitude Test. The Berkeley studies showed that 16% of entering two-year college students fell one standard deviation or more below the mean of total entrants, and it has been suggested that these students might be assumed to have IQ's of 100 or below. More definitive studies are needed to determine the incidence of low academic aptitude among Junior College students and the relationship of such ability to achievement and persistence. But it appears that the California two-year colleges must offer appropriate courses and instruction for a sizable group of young men and women with ability below that traditionally associated with college-level programs. Such a conclusion is reinforced when it is recalled that the Junior Colleges are to educate students whose high school performance did not qualify them to enter other public institutions. Many of these students bring not only deficiencies in specific subject matter, but deficiencies in basic academic skills. Although it has been shown that approximately two-thirds of entering Junior College students fall below the performance level required for admission to the State Colleges, there are differences in the ratio of eligible students attracted to individual Junior Colleges. One well-established college recently reported that a majority of its freshmen were eligible to enter four-year institutions.

High Ability Students. The two-year colleges have always been and, perhaps, will increasingly be able to attract students of superior ability. Note has been made previously of the large number of students who could have been admitted to four-year colleges. The consequence is that approximately one-third of entering Junior College students are above the mean of their fellow students who enter senior colleges. This finding is similar to that reported by Seashore in his 1958 study of academic abilities of Junior College freshmen as reported in the October 1958 Junior College Journal. Among these able students in the California colleges are those who were able to attend the University of California but chose their local community college. On measures of aptitude they are, as a group, above national means, but less impressive than their peers who actually entered the University. It is also important to note that the interests and motivations of these select groups of Junior College students are somewhat different from those of their peers. This finding seemed to suggest that even very able students at the community colleges

may need an environment which is concerned with their development as students, and teachers who are committed to that task.

FAMILY BACKGROUND

There are now sufficient data about the antecedent characteristics of Junior College students to permit several generalizations: These are made with the full recognition that community colleges attract students from all sections of California society. Nevertheless, students from the homes of clerical, skilled, and unskilled workers are greatly in the majority. Clark, for example, found that the student body at San Jose Junior College reflected the socioeconomic structure of the community it served. This and other studies indicate, too, that the more metropolitan the community, the more Junior College students will come from working class families. The relationship of family background to factors relevant to success in college are well established. Several of these factors are of considerable importance to Junior College education.

1. A majority of California Junior College students have parents with only high school educations.
2. Family encouragement and support is low for many Junior College students since education is not highly valued by the family. On the other hand, the upward social mobility of some working class families may result in unrealistic aspirations on the part of many students.
3. The majority of Junior College students find it necessary to work in order to support themselves in college. Often this means reduced course loads or such stress that achievement is impaired.
4. The relative lack of cultural and civic interests in homes from which a majority of Junior College students come may have profound effects on student motivation and achievement . . . and on the general student environment of the colleges.

EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS

A common experience for Junior College teachers and counselors is to discover the lack of realism in the vocational and educational goals of students. Many of these young men and women make a late decision to enter college, and others come to Junior College because they could not be admitted to other institutions. Consequently, a major objective of the community college is to help students revise their goals in the light of their aptitudes, interests, and past preparation. In particular, this means that many students discover that they cannot transfer to a four-year college. Whereas, over two-thirds of entering Junior College freshmen declare transfer majors only about one-third actually transfer. Many of those who fail in transfer programs are referred to as "latent terminals", and their counselors and teachers have the difficult task of helping them shift to appropriate programs for employment rather than

drop out of college. It would appear that the failure of parents, students, and high school counselors to examine the wide range of educational opportunities offered by their community colleges is a major factor in this problem. In contrast the Junior Colleges have had notable success in stimulating potentially high ability students who have set their goals too low.

Dr. Medsker has recently stated that "a large percent of Junior College students have not developed well-defined attitudes about the purposes of education and are in college either because of today's cultural pressures or because they cannot find employment." This is, perhaps, related to the findings that community college students tend to be more vocationally oriented than their four-year college peers. This is as it should be, but such student values pose problems for teachers who are primarily committed to intellectual and cultural values. Furthermore, in spite of this vocational orientation, few students have a very adequate picture of the kind of work and the educational requirements for various occupations.

In general, Junior College students show greater tendency toward authoritarianism and less tendency toward intellectual interests and reflective thought than do students at the four-year colleges. This is even true of those young men and women who are eligible to enter the University of California but who chose a local college. These student attitudes may result in a less than stimulating peer environment for intellectually oriented students. These findings place special responsibilities on Junior College faculties to provide intellectual and cultural stimulation in and outside the classroom. In this regard there is ample evidence that the relatively authoritarian student can be reached with appropriate teaching and an environment which is concerned with his growth.

PERSISTENCE AND ACHIEVEMENT IN COLLEGE

Recent studies of student attrition suggest that the high mortality data generally reported for higher education need to be refined. National studies have indicated that approximately 50% of those freshmen who begin college complete eight semesters of work. For all institutions attrition in the first two years of college is great. Iffert in 1958 reported that 72.7% of four-year college students completed at least one year of college, and this is only slightly more than the percentage he reported for Junior Colleges. One of the most complete studies of a single California Junior College shows a similar drop-out for freshmen who enrolled in 1961. In this investigation 68.5% of the class completed at least two semesters of work. Only 42%, however, completed four semesters at the college. As might have been expected, there was much variation in the persistence of students with various patterns of high school preparation. Table 4 shows the relationship between persistence and high school preparation, as well as the holding power of students in the four levels of English placement. It is this type of investigation which provides important insights into the disturbing drop-out in Junior Colleges.

TABLE 4

Persistence of 952 Students Enrolled in 1961
in a California Junior College

Eligible for	1st Sem	2nd Sem	3rd Sem	4th Sem	Percentage Survival
University -----	38	23	27	28	73.6%
State College ----- (7 units A or B)	265	198	183	159	60
State College ----- (5-6½ units A or B)	84	61	41	37	44
Ineligible ----- (college prep)	200	141	90	72	36
Ineligible ----- (vocational program)	365	222	125	109	29.9
Total Enrolled -----	952	650	461	405	42
English Placement					
1B -----	1	1	1	1	100
1A -----	219	163	133	123	56
51 -----	303	215	167	146	48
71 -----	429	271	159	134	31

Not enough is yet known about the persistence of Junior College students on a statewide basis. It is clear, however, that there are differences in the holding power among the several institutions. As a matter of fact some Junior Colleges boast about their success in holding on to students, and others about the numbers they dismiss. In general, however, the Bureau of Junior College Education in a report to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education suggested that approximately 50% of Junior College freshmen continue in the second year, and that about 30% complete two years of study. It also pointed out that about 50% of those who leave within the two years have completed a "less-than-two-year" course of study.

The percentage of students who graduate from Junior Colleges is not a suitable measure of student persistence nor of institutional success. Many students who transfer to four-year colleges do not apply for graduation, and a large percentage of those in general and occupational education do not stay long enough ... nor do they have graduation as a goal. This is quite apparent when a comparison is made of graduates in any year as compared with the full-time sophomores in the previous year. For example, there were 18,536 Junior College graduates in June 1963 for a fall 1962 enrollment of 78,864 sophomores -- 34,400 of whom were full-time. This can be only a rough comparison because Junior College students frequently do not fit the usual class designations, nor do they complete their studies in the usual sequence of semesters.

It seems quite clear that the number of Junior College students who transfer to either the University of California or the State Colleges has not kept pace with the growth of Junior College enrollments. For example, the number of transfers to the University in 1962 was almost exactly what it was in 1950 although full-time Junior College enrollments nearly doubled. During this period, however, the Junior Colleges sent an increasing number of advanced students to the State Colleges. But

again, Junior College growth would suggest a larger total number of transfers. In the past five years of growth, the two-year colleges have increased the annual number of transfer students to the State Colleges by slightly over 1,200. As a matter of fact it appears that there has been an absolute drop in this level of transfer from 1960 to 1962. These and other data are shown in Table 5 and Table 6.

TABLE 5
Junior College Transfers to the University
of California 1950-1962 *

Year	Eligible	Ineligible	Total
1950	---	---	2588
1955	939	1873	2812
1956	976	2106	3082
1957	1090	1351	2441
1958	1234	1257	2491
1959	---	---	---
1960	1158	1238	2396
1961	1180	1308	2509
1962	1358	1159	2517

* Data from the annual reports on Junior College transfers from the Office of Educational Relations, University of California, Berkeley.

TABLE 6
Junior College Transfers to the California
State Colleges 1957-1962 *

Year	Total Transfers
1957	6109
1958	7141
1959	7550
1960	8581
1961	---
1962	8317

* Data from The Center for the Study of Higher Education, Berkeley.

It should be noted that certain recent changes in the number of transfers to both the State Colleges and the University will have been influenced by provisions requiring Junior College students to complete full or nearly full lower division programs before transferring. For example, since 1960 the State Colleges have required ineligible students to complete a minimum of 60 units at a Junior College, and effective in the fall 1962 the University required transfers to complete 56 acceptable units with a grade point average (G.P.A.) of 2.4.

There is now a respectable body of data about the success of California Junior College students at both the University of California and the California State Colleges. The recent transfer study conducted by Knoell and Medsker and annual reports from the University's Office Relations with Schools suggest some slight changes in achievement of transfers from Junior Colleges when compared with data from major studies earlier in the decade. These early studies by Bird, Medsker and others are summarized as a prelude to more recent findings.

- (1) State Colleges. The grade point average of Junior College transfers has been slightly below that of native students, although the differential decreases with each succeeding semester. As is true at the University, eligible students earned higher g.p.s.'s after transfer than did the ineligible

students. In general the ineligibles did less well on aptitude and achievement tests administered at the time of transfer, and their probation rate was higher, as was the drop-out rate. Medsker reported persistence rates of 78% at Fresno State College and 87% at San Jose State College at the end of the third semester after transfer. This compared to a persistence rate of 91% for native students.

- (2) The University of California. The record of students who were eligible to enter the University for first admission did nearly as well as the native students although fewer persisted over three semesters. In general the withdrawal rate was about 35% for all transfers and 17% for native students. Since the less able students dropped out, there was a general increase in g.p.a. for those who remained ... for both eligible and ineligible groups. The latter students tended to earn grade point averages ranging from .15 to .30 below those of the eligible and native students.

Recent analysis of the records of transfer students to the University of California by the Office of Relations with Schools indicates some change in the persistence rates at Berkeley and UCLA. In 1953, 80% of the eligibles at Berkeley persisted over three semesters at Berkeley as compared to 72% of the students who entered after transfer in 1961. At UCLA the eligibles improved with a persistence of 72% in 1961 as compared to an earlier persistence of 68%. Interestingly enough, the UCLA ineligibles also had a three semester persistence of 72% as compared with the 1953 rate of 69%. Both transfer groups at the two campuses continue to earn over a C average for the first semester after transfer.

The following data are adapted from the Knoell-Medsker report for a sample of Junior College Students who transferred in 1960 to selected four-year campuses in California.

TABLE 7

First Semester Transfer Records of Selected Institutions
by Junior College Students in 1960

Achievement	UCB	UCLA	U. of Pac.	USC	Long Beach State	SF State
Continued with "C" or better	64%	70%	62%	83%	73%	68%
Continued with below "C"	24%	20%	22%	15%	22%	20%
Failed to comp. term or withdrew end of term	12%	10%	15%	2%	5%	14%

The grade point differentials for five of the above institutions for first semester work and for cumulative grades for two years after transfer are shown in Table 8. These data are from Table 37 in Factors Affecting Performance of Transfer Students from Two-to-Four-Year Colleges published by the Center for the Study of Higher Education.

TABLE 8
Grade Point Differentials of Junior College Transfers
at Selected Four-Year Institutions

Institution	Differentials with Junior College g.p.a.	
	First Term	Cumulative
UCB	-.65	-.57
UCLA	-.55	-.47
Long Beach State	-.24	-.10
S.F. State	-.20	-.26
U. of Pacific	-.25	-.12

Among the major questions which develop from this brief look at the number and success of students who transfer from California Junior Colleges to four-year institutions are the following: (1) In view of the great emphasis placed on transfer education in California Junior Colleges is the actual frequency of transfer disproportionately low? (2) Would the achievement and persistence of transfer students improve if Junior Colleges were free to prescribe programs of lower division preparation and certify the readiness of students to transfer? (3) Should there not be intensive studies of the characteristics of transfer students as related to achievement in institutions with differing characteristics in order to better counsel students in the selection of a transfer college or university?

WHAT IS TO BE TAUGHT?

Within a brief span of fifty years Junior College offerings have grown from a few post-high school courses to comprehensive curricula which include full lower-division preparation for transfer, a wide spectrum of technical-vocational programs, and courses for general and continuing education. Each of these areas of the Junior College curriculum represents such diversity of opportunity for youth and adults that they should be described in detail.

PREPARATION FOR TRANSFER

Thanks to the early support from the University of California and to years of articulation with both the University and the State Colleges, the transferability of Junior College credit is today well established. A recent study of transfer students shows California to be ahead of other states in this successful flow of students to four-year institutions. Furthermore, the very structure of higher education in this state is based on the flow of students who have begun or completed their lower-division work in Junior Colleges. It is interesting to note how the recent Master Plan is implementing Dean Lange's early advice about distributing the University's (and now the State Colleges') "swollen resources in freshmen and sophomores" to the Junior Colleges. Today approximately 75% of California's lower-division students are studying

in the two-year institutions, and by 1975 this figure should reach 85%. It is quite obvious that such a dominant role for Junior Colleges in preparing students for transfer could be possibly only if these colleges had programs of comparable quality when compared to those of the four-year institutions.

To be sure, the Junior Colleges have faced serious problems in gaining full acceptability for their courses. Furthermore, they have had to balance their experimentation against the demands for course parallelism from the University and more recently from the State Colleges. Another difficulty in this history of articulation has been the lack of uniformity within and among the colleges and universities. Diversity in standards, content, and methods makes the struggle for parallelism almost ridiculous. Are there no alternatives? A solution which is recommended by many Junior College leaders is for colleges and universities to accept at face value those courses which Junior Colleges certify as meeting requirements for Junior standing. The State Colleges and Junior Colleges have approximated such an arrangement, and the success of transfer students from the latter institutions would justify a comparable experiment in the transfer of Junior College students to campuses of the University of California. It appears that the Junior Colleges, themselves, have not taken seriously this proposal for certifying students for transfer even though the quality of instruction and the advisement of students in these colleges should contribute to the success of such an arrangement. Whether this or some other proposal is adopted, it seems imperative that Junior Colleges play leadership roles in the development of lower division education.

There are few if any undergraduate majors for which a student cannot receive appropriate lower-division preparation at his local community college. Furthermore, if he should take the proper sequence of courses, he would be granted full junior status upon transferring to a State College or a campus of the University. In actual practice, however, many students transfer with minor deficiencies which must be completed before they are fully recognized as upper-division students by their transfer institution. Occasionally a specific Junior College may not offer a full major in a highly specialized field such as architecture, and eligible students are advised to transfer after one year at a Junior College.

Since a normal lower division program includes approximately 60 units of study, it is common for 20-40 units to be required for the major. The remaining units are devoted to the liberal arts and elective options. Frequently, of course, students must repair deficiencies before beginning or completing work in the major. As a result, their Junior College work may well exceed 60 units. Although individual Junior Colleges prescribe requirements for the associate-in-arts degree, transfer students need not meet these requirements as a condition for transfer. Occasionally they cannot do so if they are to complete specialized requirements for their majors.

Although at present nearly one-third (in 1963, 28.17) of total Junior College enrollments are in "occupation-centered" curricula, many

of the courses which make up these programs are part of the regular lower-division curriculum. Since the remaining two-thirds of the enrollments are in transfer curricula, it can be seen that the offerings of the Junior Colleges are heavily oriented toward traditional lower division work. It is necessary to ask if this preponderance of transfer courses -- remembering the pressures for "parallelism" -- is congruent with either the general education or vocational needs of the majority of students whom the Junior Colleges are to serve?

PREPARATION FOR EMPLOYMENT

The scope of Junior College programs designed to prepare students for employment covers virtually the entire range of skilled and technical occupations. Individual Junior Colleges differ in the nature of their "occupation centered" curricula because of differences in the communities they serve, institutional size and resources, and commitments to occupational education. There are over 120 separate occupational curricula offered by California Junior Colleges with some colleges offering as few as three and others with more than fifty programs. The most common technical programs are engineering technology, electronics technology, and drafting. Business occupations make up the largest vocational group attracting 13.8% of all students in 1963 who declared majors.

Some of the vocational curricula listed in catalogues involve a mere clustering of standard courses which tradition or investigation suggest as appropriate preparation for employment in an occupational field. Journalism, advertising, and business management might represent such loose patterns of preparation. On the other hand, a number of programs involve building and equipping of specialized facilities, the employment of teachers with particular training and experience, and continuous relationships with advisory committees. Dental assisting, aeronautics, garment manufacture, and metallurgical technology represent these highly structured programs. Briefly, then, the various occupational curricula encompass the applied and graphic arts; business and commerce; agriculture, horticulture and forestry; the skilled trades and crafts; the science and engineering technologies, and health, governmental, recreation, and other services.

It is increasingly inappropriate to refer to these technical-vocational programs as terminal education. In actual practice many students seek or are offered employment before completing the planned sequence of work. A great number, however, return for additional study in the extended day programs and ultimately earn a certificate of completion or the associate in arts degree. If present predictions are valid, most employed persons in our society will need extensive retraining several times during their working careers. At present, California Junior Colleges play the major role in the training and retraining of California's skilled labor force. Because of this fact California is well ahead of any other state in the number of preparatory trade and industrial offerings and in technology curricula offered under Title VIII of the National Defense Education Act. Even though empirical evidence is lacking, it appears that California's remarkable economic development and its singular contribution to modern

technology are in part the result of the availability and quality of occupational education in its public Junior Colleges.

The State requires that a Junior College major include at least 20 units of appropriate course work. In practice, however, there is great pressure to add courses to the major which consequently reduces the opportunity for general education. It is true, nevertheless, that the Junior Colleges have been quite successful in reducing the hours spent in manipulative activities. There has been a steady upgrading of the occupational programs with increased emphasis on technical knowledge and mathematical and communication skills. One consequence of this change has been the increase in prerequisite courses and the development of appropriate service courses. These changes reflect the fact that work in our society is becoming more cognitive. In general, the Junior Colleges are giving increased emphasis to preparation for a family of occupations rather than to specific preparation for an entry job.

Junior Colleges have attempted to confront the dual purposes of vocational education -- to train skilled workers and to educate the students they serve. The colleges have done so primarily by seeking to give equal status to vocational and liberal education. They have been only partially successful in doing so. Existing studies show that faculties are divided regarding the importance of vocational education and particularly as to what programs should be offered. It is important to note, nevertheless, that vocational instructors are well integrated into Junior College faculties although they frequently have different reference groups from teachers in the more traditionally academic fields. It is these reference groups -- professional societies, university peers, labor organizations -- which influence attitudes about who should be educated and how. These different points of view can be strengths, but the education of skilled and semi-professional workers in a comprehensive community college is possible only if all segments of a faculty can work together toward common institutional goals. To give a specific example, if the liberal arts instructors are not willing or able to provide effective remedial courses in language, mathematics, and study skills, actual and potential vocational students will be pushed out of the Junior Colleges. (Push-outs are often referred to as drop-outs.) Or if liberal education continues to be confused with introductory preparation for advanced study, it will remain irrelevant to a majority of Junior College students and discourage their continuation in programs designed to prepare them to live, as well as to work. These issues seem directly related to the problem of attracting students to a number of vocational programs. In spite of the fact that 75% of Junior College students are not now transferring to four-year institutions, only one-third are in occupation-centered programs. The Junior College record in working with the "latent terminal" student still leaves something to be desired. To be sure the reluctance on the part of many students to choose vocational programs reflects the status values of society. For the student there are many clues regarding the status of various programs, including the attitudes of teachers toward those programs.

The new national concern for both technical-vocational education

and education for the culturally disadvantaged should bring new vigor to the traditional Junior College commitment to serve those students who are unable or do not seek to transfer. There are, however, counter influences which are discussed through this report. The issue, then, is whether Junior College people and those who help guide their institutions will persevere in redefining what is college level education in the light of legitimate and known needs of students not served by the other segments of higher education. In addition to federal stimulation and resources there are encouraging events at the local levels which are bringing strength to technical-vocational education. Several districts have completed studies which should guide them in developing regional cooperation in the use of resources, facilities, and faculties in serving youth and adults. A related development is the formation of multi-campus districts which enhanced resources for vocational education. As these changes take place colleges will have the assistance of such facilities as the Center for the Study of Vocational Education at the University of California.

EDUCATION FOR LIFE

The Educational Policies Commission's recent call for universal higher education which "frees the mind" comes at a time of near demise of viable programs of general education in American colleges and universities. Furthermore, in spite of the dramatic diversity in student bodies at these some 2,000 institutions there appears to be a steady movement toward similarity in their curricula. This, too, in spite of the strong evidence that students who are different should be educated differently.

Most of the great experiments in general education are but memories, and the use of introductory courses for the several disciplines is now near universal in meeting general education requirements. Such is the picture of general education in California Junior Colleges, as well, with but few exceptions. In spite of the talk and catalogue claims it is difficult to report more than minimum commitment to general education in 1964. Again part of the problem has been the difficulty in getting experimental and unconventional courses accepted for transfer. Nevertheless, several Junior Colleges have been able to surmount this problem by the quality of their new courses and persistent articulation efforts. There appear to be more basic factors which have contributed to the gap between Junior College claims and practices in providing meaningful general education for all students. Among them are:

- (1) An increasing number of Junior College Teachers see themselves as specialists and are unable or unwilling to teach courses with conceptual objectives which cut through the walls between subjects. Furthermore, some of them may not have been exposed to great courses in the liberal arts and sciences in their own educations.
- (2) With the present emphasis on making undergraduate studies primarily preparation for graduate education, introductory courses in the disciplines tend to emphasize methodology and fail to touch students with modest academic and intellectual interests.

- (3) General education courses are taught predominately by the lecture method. The result is frequent alienation of those many students who are neither verbally nor intellectually oriented but who need teaching which motivates and arouses curiosity.
- (4) The claims for general education have been too grandiose and comprehensive. Courses which should be designed to develop interests in and powers to pursue life-long learning should not be the patent medicine of education.

In its 1964 publication, *Universal Opportunity for Education Beyond the High School*, the Educational Policies Commission places this problem within the context of all higher education.

As more students continue their education beyond the high school, the need for motivating students and the difficulty of doing it increase. For most students the rational powers develop best under guidance and example of an expert, responsive, flexible teacher who is himself committed to the search for truth. ... Therefore, nonselective colleges will, for the foreseeable future, need many teachers dedicated less to creation of specialists and more to the advancement of each student regardless of his ability -- less to the student already interested in the teacher's particular specialty than to students whose interest in the general field need to be aroused.²

In California Junior Colleges there are some very exciting courses and programs with life-long learning as their goals. There is also mounting evidence that students of varying abilities and motivations can be reached and changed as a result of college experiences in and out of the classroom. It would seem, then, that a professional attack on the problem of relevant general education is long overdue in Junior College education. This problem is at the heart of the issue of who is to be educated.

EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

There are those who believe that the pressing demands of contemporary society cannot wait for the abilities and leadership of young men and women now in school. They would advocate a great push in adult education, not only to provide the retraining needed for employment, but to help develop knowledge and judgment about the great issues of the day.

The extent to which Junior Colleges serve California adults is impressive indeed. In the fall 1963 there were 239,787 part-time students and 156,574 "defined adults"³ in graded classes. In addition there were a total of 66,784 students in classes for adults, or ungraded classes. It is difficult to make much sense out of these data since the traditional concepts of adult education or evening education no longer apply in

² P. 14.

³ Any student who has attained his twenty-first birthday on or before February 1 who has enrolled in fewer than 10 class hours.

Junior Colleges. Many full-time students take courses in the evening, and a large percentage of students in the day are part-time. Furthermore, "adults" are identified primarily for record keeping purposes rather than because of their choice of programs. In order to understand the Junior College role in continuing education it is necessary to examine recent State measures to differentiate functions among the various segments of public education and to support education for adults.

On February 14, 1963, the State Board of Education established criteria and standards for graded Junior College classes. This decision followed several years of concern among legislators about standards in Junior College and State College classes for adults, and about what appeared to be wasteful overlapping among the institutions which provided education for adults. The 1959 legislative session called for an investigation of adult education which was later conducted by the Assembly Interim Committee on Education. Since the Committee defined adult education so as to include all part-time education for adults regardless of educational level, it looked into the extension services of the University of California, the extension services and extended day program of the State Colleges, the extended day and adult education programs of Junior Colleges, and the high school adult education programs.

In general the Committee supported the Governor's earlier recommendation to reduce State support for adult education. It further directed the Coordinating Council to recommend ways of reducing the competition among the various institutions. These and related recommendations concerning the delineation of functions, coordination, and financing of continuing education programs were forwarded to the Legislature in 1963.⁴ In the meantime the State Department of Education with the cooperation of the California Junior College Association and other groups submitted to the State Board recommended definitions of "graded" and "ungraded" classes. These criteria went through some 16 drafts before being adopted. In general terms a graded class must have been approved by the State Board of Education and have one or more of the following characteristics: 1) be of college level and provide prerequisite, component, or elective credit toward an associate-in-arts degree; 2) be part of a "beyond high school" vocational or technical program leading toward an associate in arts degree and/or an occupational certificate; 3) be recognized by accredited colleges and universities in California as part of a required or permissive general education and/or elective studies.

The State Board also adopted standards for such graded classes which include procedures for course approval, length of course of study, qualifications of students admitted to courses, and for the grading and evaluation of these students. It is likely that these regulations have speeded the general trend toward making continuing education in Junior Colleges more traditionally academic, but at the same time they have eliminated some courses of doubtful standards and appropriateness.

⁴ See CCHE, Continuing Education Programs in California Higher Education, #1005, (Sacramento and San Francisco, July 1963), 45 pp.

Of equal importance to the future of continuing education is the level of State support for adults attending Junior Colleges. The amount of State equalization aid is computed differently for those defined as adults. In defining adults as students over 21 enrolled in less than 10 units, it was the intent of the Legislature to provide less State support for adult education. In reference to Junior Colleges this is accomplished by lower apportionment for adult a.d.a. than for non-adult a.d.a. In 1964 the foundation program for non-adult a.d.a. was \$600, but for adult a.d.a. it was only \$490 with a maximum entitlement of \$230. This difference takes on special importance in view of the fact that the cost of graded classes is considerably higher than the cost of non-graded classes, and that there are three times as many "adult" students in graded as compared with non-graded classes. The result is a significant reduction in the level of State support for the entire Junior College program. Consequently, it is the recommendation of most leaders that State aid for "defined adults" be the same as for minors. If this were done, the overall level of State support for Junior Colleges would be substantially increased.

The problem of support cannot be separated from the larger issue of how well Junior Colleges will serve the continuing education needs of their communities. It would seem that the race to replace "adult" education with degree, transfer, and employment-oriented education would conflict with the growing educational needs associated with leisure and self-improvement. The Legislature may be right that such services are the responsibility of local communities. If so, it would seem important to reduce the heavy load on the local taxpayer for education of adults in graded classes. At present there are no adequate studies to show the impact of these changing attitudes about and regulations for the education of adults in Junior Colleges. As has been noted, there is an accelerated shift toward graded classes, but at the same time Junior Colleges are making greater use of the community service tax for cultural activities. It may be that these colleges, through community service programs and through comprehensive offerings throughout the extended day, will find a better pattern of serving adults than represented by more traditional adult education. Nevertheless, a major issue must be faced: What effect will the new orientation of Junior Colleges to higher education have on their programs of continuing education?

REMEDIAL EDUCATION

The Junior Colleges have traditionally attempted to educate all students who entered their open doors. Over the years this has meant much experimentation in curriculum and teaching methods. In brief, these efforts have had as their goals the development of academic skills and motivation in students who seek another chance in college. No other segment of higher education has accepted such a challenge, and there are those who counsel the Junior Colleges to give up these "less than college" level activities. Unfortunately this counsel comes at a time when our society is beginning to attack the problems of training the untrained and educating the under-educated. By tradition and by defined responsibility the Junior Colleges should lead this attack.

In any case, if the Junior Colleges are to provide technical-vocational education at a level different from the other segments of higher education; if they are to help remedy deficiencies in students with the potential of continuing their educations, there seems to be no alternative but to take students where they are and to give them the means to develop capacities and interests. This is not a matter of sentimentality nor is it a call to indulge those students who will not achieve. It is a call for appropriate courses taught by teachers who care and who have professional skills needed in this most difficult area of teaching.

THE REDEFINITION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

What is taught in the first two years of college has undergone profound changes since the founding of the denominational colleges of the early American colonies. The changes have involved both the level at which certain disciplines are to be taught and the very nature of the offerings themselves. For example, there has been a steady movement of "college level" work into the secondary schools, or as more frequently noted, college standards have been raised over the decades. Equally fundamental changes have resulted from the ever-expanding realm of human knowledge and the acceptability of certain fields of knowledge within hallowed halls. It is scarcely a century since the natural sciences became respectable enough to be included in the curriculum, and the social sciences are of even more recent vintage.

College curricula have also been influenced by a mythology which seeks to distinguish the so-called pure or theoretical fields from the applied. It is likely that some such dimensions exist at the scholarly levels of academe, but the dividing line is illusive indeed. At the introductory levels of knowledge it is likely that all subjects are applied -- and furthermore vocational in any meaningful sense of the word. For example, the introductory course in chemistry is as functional to the career of the chemist as typing is to the career of the secretary. In any case, the courses in our early colleges were explicitly practical and had as their goals the education of gentlemen.

As Americans moved west to conquer the continent they took their colleges with them, and these colleges changed as the people's needs changed. Now they needed trained farmers and skilled workers as well as gentlemen. Later they needed scientists and scholars and technicians. Each of these great changes in American society have been marked by changes in the college curriculum. The land grant colleges brought education to the farms and to the new industrial communities, and new programs were created to deal with their fertile land and their machines. Then at the turn of the century the inventiveness and curiosity of the age gave stimulation to the new universities which have since brought us so swiftly into the atomic age and helped build a society of unequalled abundance. These changes were accompanied by true revolutions in what was to be taught in our colleges, and how it was to be taught.

Social changes of unequalled magnitude have been entwined with and stimulated by these technical-scientific revolutions. From all segments of American society have come demands for education and training beyond the high school. These demands are being met to a degree unknown in any

other civilization or society. Today the most compelling response to these demands for education is the rapid development of people's colleges.

These summary comments seem necessary because of some damaging myths about what is college level work and what is not. For example:

Myth 1. Only those courses which are recognized by universities for transfer purposes are "college level."

Myth 2. There is some sort of absolute standard for college courses which is determined by the nature of the subject taught, and which can be readily determined and applied regardless of the students being taught.

Myth 3. Education for immediate employment is somehow less collegiate than education for work which requires transfer to another institution.

Other myths also clutter up discussions about what should be taught in Junior Colleges. This in spite of the fact that the most compelling insight which comes from reading the history of American higher education is that which is taught in college is a matter of constant change and redefinition. Each new institution -- the land grant colleges, the universities, the Junior Colleges -- has defined curricula and standards in the light of pressing American needs. There are no absolutes: there are no inferior curricula except those which are badly taught.

The issues of what is to be taught in Junior Colleges is of particular urgency in 1964. There are those who see the Master Plan as a mandate to "raise standards" in Junior Colleges and to eliminate courses from the curriculum which are "less than college level." Although it is rarely done, both of these vague criteria need to be defined in a manner appropriate to Junior College education. The following ideas seem essential to these definitions:

Standards. The only meaningful definition of "standards" in education is determined by the quality of teaching and the resources for learning. Badly taught courses have low standards whether they are at the freshmen or graduate levels. Excellently taught courses have high standards whether they are concerned with remedial English or quantum physics. There is no necessary relationship between high standards and the number of students who fail or who are forced to drop from a class.

College Level. Those courses which concern themselves with the educational needs of young and mature adults as they prepare for advanced study, skilled work, or as they seek greater freedom and refinement of mind are of college level. In California such courses are to be determined by the characteristics of students who are to be educated in the various segments of a differentiated system of higher education. Certainly what is college level cannot be determined solely by the curriculum of

the elite segment of that system or by the characteristics of its students.

It seems appropriate in summing up this discussion to point out that the quality of an institution is best judged by what it is able to accomplish with the student it accepts, rather than by its ability to attract high ability students. The Junior Colleges can compete on this basis since they are established to educate the other segments of higher education. Whether the Junior Colleges fully succeed or not depends to a great extent upon the relevance of their courses and their standards of teaching their heterogeneous students.

GOVERNANCE OF JUNIOR COLLEGES: CHANGES AND CHALLENGES

The issue of how California Junior Colleges are to be governed is to a great extent an outgrowth of the problems of numbers. Expanding enrollments and budgets, the building of complete new campuses and facilities -- all have brought changes to the internal structure of colleges and demands for new approaches to coordination and service at a statewide level. These actual and contemplated organizational changes have implications for all aspects of Junior College education. However, there are certain fundamental questions which seem particularly relevant to the three major areas of change. It is to these questions that the following sections are devoted. Does the trend toward large, regional, and multi-campus districts threaten the role of Junior Colleges as community institutions? What effect will the establishment of academic senates and formal faculty authority have on the comprehensive, open-door college? Will proposed legislative measures to provide more efficient coordination and development of the statewide system of Junior Colleges diminish or enhance the vitality of local control?

JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICTS IN TRANSITION

The movement toward independent Junior College districts, which began with the enabling legislation in 1921, has in recent years changed the structure and the character of Junior College education in California. This trend was particularly encouraged by the Legislature in 1961. A general policy has been established for the inclusion of all high school and unified districts within districts maintaining Junior College districts. Furthermore, no districts except independent Junior College districts may now be formed to provide Junior College education. In general this trend, which is shown in Table 9, has resulted from the increasing identification of Junior Colleges with higher education and the resulting wish to be independent of the elementary and secondary schools. But equally important have been the need and the demands for Junior Colleges to achieve greater efficiency in the development and use of financial resources, utilization of staff and facilities, and in general management.

The rapid movement toward independence, however, has been accompanied

TABLE 9
Changing Patterns of Junior Colleges
District Reorganization

Year	Independent District	High School District	Unified District
1900	28	18	12
1961	39	9	12
1963	48	5	11
1964	56	2	8

by considerable growth in the size of districts. At present six Junior College districts are county-wide and four more are nearly so. Furthermore, four additional districts include substantial portions of two or more counties. This change in district organization recently led a spokesman from the Office of the Legislative Analyst to say in testimony before the Senate Sub-Committee on Higher Education:

... As these districts continue to grow in territory and population served, it becomes increasingly difficult to think of them as community institutions which are closely guided by local voters rather than as large autonomous districts, relatively independent in relation to the individual communities which they encompass.

The diminishing of local identity and service must be examined as a possible consequence of bigness. Certainly trustees in this new type of district represent different communities, and central administration must seek compromises among the competing demands from campuses within the district. But there are counter trends to this apparent loss of community identity.

Present practices in California's multiple-campus districts and the philosophy which is beginning to take shape place great emphasis on the autonomy of individual campuses and their responsiveness to the special characteristics of their local communities. Furthermore, there may be new resources and staff available to identify and respond to community needs. In this regard it seems likely that the freeing of local leadership from major responsibilities for fiscal and facilities management of districts may give a substantial boost to the community college concept. Junior Colleges have grown rapidly and have achieved status under a system of local autonomy. It remains to be seen whether the present trend toward large regional districts will enhance or threaten this tradition.

Very little is known about the relationship between district organization and the achievement of Junior College goals. Such studies are long overdue. There is evidence, however, that faculty and administrative attitudes toward the objectives and practices of the comprehensive, open-door college vary with the pattern of institutional organization. This may result in part from the fact that large independent Junior Colleges increasingly employ teachers who are subject matter specialists. Quite apart from the merits of such specialization, it appears that many of these teachers are more

interested in their disciplines than in contributing to the community functions of the college or in experimenting with less conventional methods of reaching a large number of Junior College youth who don't really know what it means to be a student and who place little value on intellectual activity. What influence this faculty orientation will have on educational policy is unclear, but we can already find an English department which refuses to teach remedial English and a faculty which prides itself on grading more rigorously than the University of California. The point, of course, is that legislation and policy decisions which change the structure and personnel of Junior Colleges may also alter the colleges' character and objectives. Therefore, decisions about district structure and governance should always be tested against the purposes of Junior College education.

THE SHARING OF AUTHORITY

There has long been a sharing of responsibilities in the determination of policies within some Junior Colleges, but this partnership has been a sometimes thing and has lacked formal sanctions. Under law the Legislature has delegated to elected trustees of Junior College districts broad residual power for determining and executing policy. This authority has then been delegated, in part, to professional administrators who are held directly responsible for the consequences of their actions. In California no school official has tenure as a result of his administrative status. The third source of authority in college governance rests with the faculties. However potent teachers may have been in influencing the formation of policy and either giving life to or burying policy decisions, their authority in California Junior Colleges has been informal, misunderstood, and without foundation in law. A major area for misunderstanding and partisanship has centered on the question of whether authority could be delegated to teachers, since apparently concomitant responsibility could not be. Such doubts seem to rest on the assumption that tenure is the measure of responsibility and to deny the profound responsibility of teachers in student welfare and professional matters. In reality teachers pay the consequences of their actions when they are evaluated by students, colleagues, and to a degree by the community they serve. Unfortunately, the latter point is somewhat of a cliché since the role of teacher has not been closely associated with educational leadership until recently. Today marks a change in the role of Junior College teachers and the governance of colleges in which they teach.

All the participants in this move toward collegiality -- legislators, trustees, administrators, and teachers -- have sought some model which would be particularly appropriate for the community college. None seems quite right. Although a few faculty leaders continue to be attracted to the Academic Senate of the University of California and similar bodies, there is increasing awareness within faculty associations that Junior Colleges may need a more flexible and democratic organization for influencing policy. Furthermore, it seems to have come as a surprise to many of those caught up in the present debates on academic senates that the principle of faculty authority arrived very late on the American scene. The early American college and the contemporary public schools share a common heritage in matters of authority and control. The tradition is essentially bureaucratic

and has been influenced by both ecclesiastic and business enterprise. It is only after the turn of the century that faculties gained increasing responsibility and authority in some colleges and universities. The principle of collegiality has slowly developed around the concepts of expertness and professional self-regulation. In brief, it means that decisions affecting complex and specialized fields of knowledge are to be made by those qualified as a result of prescribed education and experience. Organizationally this has resulted in growing emphasis on departmental authority and the development of academic senates concerned primarily with personnel matters and the advancement of academic freedom.

Several Junior College faculties had established effective councils for investigation of issues and recommending policy to their administrators and trustees prior to recent statewide efforts to establish academic senates. It was, however, the leadership of the Junior College Faculty Association and the American Federation of Teachers which achieved legislative action on this matter. It was clearly the intent of Assembly Resolution No. 48 - to encourage the establishment of academic senates, and within a year the State Board of Education implemented the resolution by adding section 131.6 to Title 5 of the California Administrative Code. In brief, this section directs governing boards of each district to establish an academic senate or faculty council if requested by the faculty after it has voted by means of secret ballot. The consequences of this mandate may be profound, but the movement toward faculty authority has developed so rapidly that there has been little time to examine its meaning for Junior College objectives. There are, consequently, little empirical data to support the following observations.

It is likely that many administrators and trustees regret a State mandate in matters involving the internal organization and management of Junior Colleges. On the other hand, faculty association presidents, meeting at San Diego in October 1963, almost unanimously advocated the mandating of academic senates by the State Board of Education. It is interesting to note that CJCFA and AFT leaders have consistently sought State involvement and action in matters which traditionally have been local responsibilities. This philosophy was clearly stated in a July 1964 position paper by the CJCFA. "From the point of view of the Faculty Association most of the real gains in junior college education have come through legislation." Understandably, organized faculty groups find it easier to deal with the Legislature and the State Board of Education than they do with sixty-six local boards which have shown no marked sympathy toward formal faculty involvement in policy formation. In spite of these different orientations to college governance, there has been diversity of opinion on the issue of academic senates within each group -- faculty, administrators, and trustees. Debate on the role of Junior College teachers in policy formation has been intense but remarkably mature. As a result, in submitting his report regarding ACR 48 for consideration by the State Board of Education, the Chief of the Bureau of Junior College Education was able to conclude: "We have presented recommendations that the vast majority of teachers, administrators, and governing boards would find workable and acceptable realizing at the same time that they may not be completely acceptable to anyone."

In adopting an emergency regulation so that academic senates or faculty councils could become fully effective for the 1964-65 school year the State Board of Education defined such a body as an organization "whose primary function is, as the representative of the faculty, to make recommendations to the administration and the governing board of a school district with respect to academic and professional matters." As has been suggested, the establishment, composition, structure, and procedures of such organizations are to be determined by secret and democratic election procedures. The State Board also attempted to resolve what had become topics of intense differences of opinion within Junior Colleges. It decided that, "Faculty" means those certificated persons who teach full-time in a Junior College or other full-time certificated persons who do not perform any services for the college that require an administrative or supervisory credential." And secondly, although a senate or council is to present written views and recommendations, to the governing board through regularly established channels, the faculty body "after consultation with the administration, may present its views and recommendations directly to the governing board."

A 1964 study of Junior College faculty associations shows that the establishment of academic senates or faculty councils represent their first order of business. Actually, several senates or councils have now been established, are functioning, and formally recognized by their college trustees. It may be to the interest of these organizations and to Junior College education that there is no compelling model for formal faculty authority. Consequently, there should be a great deal of experimentation as trustees, administrators, and faculty learn to share power and responsibility. It seems clear, however, that the committee structure in many Junior Colleges will be changed with senate committees either replacing or working tangent to the more traditional advisory committees.

It might be well to describe the committee structure of a recently established faculty senate to illustrate this point and to show the inclusiveness of faculty involvement in policy formation. (These functions have been taken from the by-laws for the faculty senate of a northern California Junior College.)

Professional Personnel Policies Committee. This committee shall develop policy and advise the Faculty Senate on such matters as recruiting, selection, evaluation, assignment, teaching loads, promotion, retention, tenure, sabbatical leave, credential requirements, and accreditation of certified personnel.

Student Personnel Policies Committee. This committee shall develop policy and advise the Faculty Senate on such matters as conduct, discipline, probation, inter and intra-college activities, scholarships, student loans, student government, out-of-district students, bookstore, and cafeteria.

Instruction Committee. This committee shall develop policy and advise the Faculty Senate on such matters as curriculum, admissions, honors, degree requirements, retention of students,

library and audio-visual center, development and maintenance of instructional facilities, college goals and objectives.

Finance Committee. This committee shall develop policy and advise the Faculty Senate on all matters pertaining to college finance.

The great experiment is underway and there will continue to be debate about the implications of the new faculty role for Junior College objectives and for the big questions about who gets educated and how? There are those who see bleak years ahead as faculty oligarchies become entrenched and resistant to change. Others predict that the "academic" teachers will dominate the senates and pressure local boards and State agencies to modify the open-door policy of California Junior Colleges. And certainly there is fear that chronic conflicts of authority will make it difficult for Junior Colleges to respond to the changing needs of communities and the nation. Each of these predictions might come to pass, of course, but they seem to deny the essential good judgment of Junior College personnel and the tradition of cooperation upon which this new structure is being built. It seems far more likely that faculty nagging at some programs and services which are uniquely those of the Junior College will give way to responsible investigation of the needs for such programs. What at times have appeared to be negative positions by some faculties may be replaced by positive and professional programs for doing the job that must be done and doing it well. In summation, it seems likely that California Junior Colleges have immeasurably strengthened the means by which they may arrive at intelligent decisions at a time of crisis in education. The professional knowledge and experience of teachers should enhance the dedication and institutional view which characterize many Junior College administrators and trustees. The going may be tough, but those who are concerned with the continued development of an institution which is something other than a reflection of university education might appreciate this new vitality at the local level rather than interfere with it.

STATE DIRECTION AND SUPERVISION

Although guided, and to an increasing extent directed by statute, the Junior Colleges of California have been created, operated, and, in large part, supported locally. At the State level it has been the Legislature's responsibility to establish statewide policies for the governance of the Junior Colleges by local boards and to designate those State agencies responsible for seeing that these policies are carried out and for serving the local districts. The Office of the Legislative Analyst has recently summed up this division of responsibilities.

Aside from making provisions for the appropriation and proper allocation of state subventions, existing legislation is confined largely to six areas: the composition, powers and duties of local governing boards; procedure for district formation and organization; property management; district taxation and bonding; teacher credentialing; admission; and, to a much lesser extent, the broad structure of the junior college

educational program. Other major areas such as curricula, salaries and personnel policies, expenditure control, academic and facility planning, and instructional standards have been left to the individual district governing boards.

The accretion of statutory guidelines has become increasingly disturbing to those who must direct the development and operation of Junior Colleges. As of 1964 there were at least 150 sections of the Education Code which were concerned with Junior College matters. They represent a strange mixture of major policy statutes and almost trivial mandates. But even more numerous are the rules and regulations under Title V of the Administrative Code. Here are found the policies of the State Board of Education which has the responsibility of prescribing minimum standards for the formation and operation of public Junior Colleges and for exercising general supervision over them. The Board has chosen to limit its supervisory role except when specifically directed to do otherwise by statute or legislative resolution.

The bureaucratic web has become most unmanageable in the areas of policy advice and execution. The one agency of State government most responsible for the Junior Colleges, the State Department of Education, has so split its administrative responsibility among its own administrative hierarchy that it is seemingly impossible for it to adequately serve or make coordinated policy decisions affecting the Junior Colleges. Specifically, there are nearly twenty bureaus or agencies of the Department which have connection with or responsibilities for Junior Colleges. Within this complex the Bureau of Junior College Education has neither the status nor the staff to bring order out of these overlapping and uncoordinated activities.

The full complexity of State responsibilities becomes apparent with a comment about some of the other agencies and commissions which concern themselves with Junior College matters.

The State Department of Finance has great influence since it may (1) include funds within the Governor's budget for both operating and capital expenses for Junior Colleges over and above those required by statute; (2) work with legislators to obtain separate legislation authorizing increased financial assistance; (3) actively oppose any financial increases at all, and (4) remain neutral regarding financial proposals.

The Coordinating Council for Higher Education has the responsibility for developing plans for the orderly growth of public higher education, including Junior Colleges. By its studies and recommendations it may influence both State and local policies regarding all aspects of Junior College education.

The State Department of Public Works is responsible for reviewing the architectural plans of, and final constructional approval of, Junior College facilities.

The Office of the Legislative Analyst has the power to make specific recommendations regarding all aspects of Junior College education, but in particular curriculum, finances, and facilities construction.

The California Scholarship Commission may have influence regarding the flow of scholarship students to public Junior Colleges.

There is no responsible person in California who is prepared to defend the status quo regarding State direction and supervision of Junior College education. It is somewhat embarrassing, however, while examining the neater, more centralized, and formally coordinated systems in Florida, Arizona, or Massachusetts to realize that the Junior Colleges have flourished most fully in California. There is something of value in the loosely coordinated system which must be identified and preserved. On the other hand it is probably fair to conclude that California's Junior Colleges have thrived in spite of the complexity of statewide activities rather than because of it. Alternatives are now being debated. The decisions which must be made will have profound influence on whether there is to be orderly development and adequate support for Junior Colleges in the coming years. In the long run, of course, the viability of California's diverse system of public higher education is at stake.

THE ROLE OF ASSOCIATIONS

In the absence of substantial leadership at the State level, important roles have been played by unofficial organizations in bringing about cooperation and coordination among the increasing number of Junior Colleges. The more influential of these organizations are the Junior College section of the California School Board Association, the recently formed California Junior College Faculty Association, the California Teachers Association, and especially, the California Junior College Association (CJCA). Over the years this latter association has become a semi-official coordinating and policy-making body. Although it could never speak authoritatively for the Junior College system, the CJCA -- which primarily represented Junior College administrators -- was notably successful in influencing legislation and in sharing methods of solving problems.

The growth and new status of the two-year colleges in recent years has greatly changed the CJCA and modified its effectiveness as an informal coordinating agency. With the increased militancy of faculty groups -- particularly the California Junior College Faculty Association -- and the demand of trustees for greater involvement in statewide activities, the CJCA in 1961 underwent a major reorganization. On paper the changes promise much-needed revitalization of the Association and the continuation of its leadership in Junior College affairs. In reality, however, there is yet no precedent, no articulate plan for welding faculty leaders, trustees, and administrators into an effective organization. The need for such a viable association is great if the Junior Colleges are to remain primarily community-centered institutions. It seems important, therefore, to look briefly at the present structure of the Association.

Much of the work of the California Junior College Association is accomplished through committees, however, the Board of Directors has great influence since it must implement policy, act on behalf of the Association, and cooperate with public and private agencies concerned with Junior College education. The 1963 membership of the Board and the several committees indicates the broadening of participation in the Association, but it also shows that it is not yet adequately representative.

California Junior College Association

Body	Faculty	Administrators	Trustees
Board of Directors *	7	14	1
Committees **			
Athletics	4	6	0
Finance and Legislation	1	9	0
Articulation	0	10	0
Curriculum & Instruction	4	7	0
Guidance & Student Pers.	3	9	0
Continuing Education	0	5	0
Accreditation	0	5	0
Student Government	0	4	0
Nominations	0	3	0
Moral & Spiritual Values	3	6	0
Nursing Education	0	6	0
Public Relations	2	6	0
Real Estate Education	3	8	0
Voc-Technical Education	1	7	0
Attendance & Enrollment	1	7	0

* The Board of Directors also includes 3 persons in other categories.
 ** Special committees and articulation conference committees are shown.

The lack of trustee representation may be misleading since trustees are members of the California School Boards Association; but in light of the increasing advocacy of their active involvement in CJCA, it would appear that they should be brought into working relationships with faculty members and administrators. Faculty representatives have been brought into leadership positions primarily in the regional associations. But even if the regions are to develop vigorous associations it would seem necessary for the statewide organization to be fully representative. It should be stressed, again, that the CJCA is an organization in transition, and it has begun to make progress in tapping resources from all segments of the Junior College movement.

ALTERNATIVES TO THE STATUS QUO

The debate on alternatives to the present structure of State policy direction and supervision has been rather low keyed, and there has been persistent counsel from a wide range of Junior College leaders against premature decisions. The Senate Sub-Committee on Higher Education has begun a series of hearings on the relationship of the public Junior Colleges to the State Board of Education and to the State Department of Education. It seems important to look at the major alternatives which are being considered and the support they have from various groups.

Consolidation of Services Within the State Department of Education. It is obvious that responsibility for Junior College education within the Department is widely distributed among the several divisions and bureaus. Better coordination in departmental service and supervision might be achieved by their consolidation. Based in part on a major study for the reorganization of the Department, the Superintendent of

Public Instruction has announced that such consolidation of services under the present Division of Higher Education is under way. In spite of the fact that consolidation is long overdue, this fait accompli may be unfortunate in view of the Stiern Committee hearings and the recommendations which have already been made by such groups as the California Junior College Association and the California Junior College Faculty Association. There is serious questions, furthermore, as to the nature of this reorganization. For example, Junior College presidents were recently impressed when assured by the Associate Superintendent that the new "Division of Higher Education Services" would be primarily concerned with Junior College matters and would have adequate staff to serve the colleges and to provide experienced leadership in the relationships with other state organizations. At the Fresno Conference of the CJCA on October 28, 1964, however, the Superintendent dismissed the idea of anything other than sectional status for Junior College activities. In light of these events it seems appropriate to report the essential positions of several groups regarding this alternative of Departmental reorganization:

We believe the size and scope of junior college activities in California public higher education fully justify establishing in the Department a Division of Junior College Education whose chief would have cabinet rank. This officer should be a person with broad junior college experience, both in classroom and as an administrator. The association has advocated this type of organization for a decade or more ... We believe that all Department staff members whose duties relate to junior colleges should be brought together in this proposed division. ... To put this suggestion differently, we believe that all relationships of any junior college and the Department of Education should be centered in this new division. ... Though it is essential and most desirable that junior colleges should remain primarily community-centered institutions under the control of local governing boards, some degree of coordination is necessary especially as regards junior college relations with the University of California, California State Colleges, and the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. The proposed division organization would provide experienced leadership in the relationships with those other organizations.

President, California Junior College Association, July 10, 1964

Better coordination in departmental supervision might be achieved by their consolidation if this can be accomplished. It is questionable, however, whether such action would assure better leadership or simply result in some improvement in coordination within the department and continuation of its essentially passive role. Because we have been able to find little continuity or clarity of purpose in recent budgetary requests by the department to augment the Bureau of Junior Colleges, we have opposed such requests and have recommended

that the department first prepare a plan indicating the proposed role of the department and the board in providing more effective services and leadership for the junior colleges.

Office of the Legislative Analyst July 10, 1964

Support the re-organization of the State Department of Education to center junior college affairs in one office.
(Recommendation, the 1965 Legislative Program of CJCA)

Chairman, Finance and Legislative Committee, October 28, 1964

The State Department of Education has only a small staff devoting itself to junior college education. It appears that the routine of junior college business consumes the available time of the staff and there is little time for creative thinking and planning which will enable junior college educators throughout the state to do better what they are doing well today and to develop new programs and new goals as they become feasible, not twenty years after. ... We would propose then that a separate board for junior college education be established, that it simply take over the powers which the present state board now has for junior college education, and that it be given funds for a somewhat enlarged staff to enable it to study and solve some of the problems ... not previously taken on.

President, California Junior College Faculty Association,
July 10, 1964

Establishment of a State Board for Junior College Education. There is a general recognition that the present State Board of Education has been unable to give adequate attention to Junior College matters. This is not due to lack of interest on the part of board members but to the magnitude of problems which face elementary, secondary, and Junior College education. The legislative advocate for the CJCA recalls a recent meeting of the Board with an agenda of forty-one separate items. "Junior College financing, the only agenda item that affected the Junior Colleges, was number forty." The establishment of a State Board of Junior College Education is being advocated as a means of filling the void in statewide leadership which now exists for the Junior Colleges.

It is likely that rather fundamental differences in beliefs about the nature of Junior College education underlie either advocacy or rejection of this proposal for a separate board. Those who believe that the genius of the Junior College movement in California rests in the community college concept are cautious about making organizational changes at the State level. It is likely that most Junior College trustees and administrators are of this conviction and prefer to retain at the local level responsibilities and leadership which some would centralize in a new State agency. These leaders recognize that Junior Colleges must have a stronger voice before the Legislature, but they would see this as best accomplished by reorganizing the present

Department of Education and by strengthening the California Junior College Association. On the other hand a number of faculty representatives, and especially the leaders of the Faculty Association, would turn more readily to State leadership in dealing with Junior College problems. As has been pointed out, they believe that most Junior College advances have come from State action and that the welfare of teachers is best assured through strong State supervision.

The following issues are among those which the CJCFA believes should be considered by a State Board of Junior College Education. There is no way of knowing how many teachers would feel that their own freedoms as well as those of local colleges might be compromised by State control in a number of these areas.

1. Proper level of financing at both the State and local levels.
2. Mandatory formation of independent Junior College Districts.
3. Establishment of quality control by some form of statewide testing.
4. Implementation of the academic senates in policy making structure of the Junior Colleges.
5. Importance of academic freedom to the community.
6. Encouragement of an exchange teacher program within the Junior Colleges and perhaps the State Colleges.
7. Modification of the sabbatical leave program to bring it more in line with other institutions of higher education.
8. Clarification of the role of the Junior College both with respect to secondary education and to higher education.
9. Evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the present accreditation program.
10. Consideration of program for statewide tenure at the Junior College level.
11. Increased cooperation between neighboring Junior Colleges in providing a rich curriculum. Also increased cooperation between State Colleges and Junior Colleges to avoid wasteful competition.

Some interest in a separate board comes from the fact that a number of states have established or are considering centralized approaches to the development of Junior College systems. Certainly these patterns of State organization should be studied, but in doing so they should be appraised in light of the educational history and needs of particular states. The needs of Arizona, Oregon, or Massachusetts, for example, are quite unlike those of California which has already developed the

nation's most extensive and distinguished program of Junior College education. Studies of State organizations show no patterns which are particularly appropriate for California with its extensive system of diversified public higher education. Within this system a high level of coordination of programs, resources, capital development, and flow of students is called for. It may, therefore, be necessary to have a State agency which can strengthen the voice of the Junior Colleges before the Legislature and in matters of articulation. Since such proposals threaten to divide the Junior College family, it is likely that some compromise will be adopted.

Creation of a Consultative Commission. One alternative to continued State passivity in Junior College governance on the one hand and centralization as represented by a separate State board on the other is the creation of a special consultative commission to advise and assist the State Board of Education in all matters pertaining to the Junior Colleges. The Office of the Legislative Analyst made the following analysis of this alternative in testimony before a recent hearing of a Senate Subcommittee.

This would be, in effect, a separate but subordinate board made up of representatives of the interested junior college parties. Presumably the department staff concerned with junior college matters would operate as the commission's staff. Presumably, also, the board would rely heavily, if not entirely, upon the advice and recommendations of such a commission while retaining formally its over-all responsibility. In this manner a separate board would be created in fact but without explicit recognition and without clear accountability.

As yet there is no widespread support for such a commission, and there is some concern that it would add still another voice and another level of bureaucracy to an already confusing situation. It is possible, however, that such a commission might be the means of focusing the increasing diversity of positions on Junior College matters into an acceptable plan for long-range development.

QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

If the issue of Junior College governance is to be resolved wisely, answers will be needed for a number of questions. Although hearings like those conducted by Senator Siern and conferences like that for which this report has been prepared ⁵ will help provide answers, it is essential that long-range appraisals of State organizational patterns be made. By whatever method answers to the following questions are arrived at, it is imperative that they be consistent with the essential goal of providing education for students not served at all or not as well served by other segments of higher education in California.

- (1) With minor reorganization is the present State structure adequate for providing supervision, long-range planning and representation for the Junior Colleges?

⁵ See Section IV.

- (2) What is the proper balance between district autonomy and central authority in such matters as curriculum, admission and retention, academic standards, personnel policies, and the determination of current and capital expenditures?
- (3) Can the Junior Colleges play their full role as a segment of public higher education as envisaged by the Master Plan and at the same time maintain their pluralistic and loosely coordinated pattern of control and representation?
- (4) Would the strengthening of centralized, statewide administration lead to the weakening of the community college concept and the autonomy of local districts?
- (5) Is the diversity of positions on Junior College issues a strength or weakness? What are the proper limitations of centralized authority in the managing of collegial affairs?

THE FACULTIES AND THEIR STANDARDS

California Junior Colleges have gained a substantial reputation for the quality of their teaching and, particularly in recent years, for their administrative leadership in developing new and changing institutions. Today, new roles and responsibilities are imminent for each group as a result of both statutes and the changing nature of internal and statewide governance. In the process of examining the factors which influence the performance and standards of Junior College teachers and administrators it is possible to identify a number of issues which are important to the future development of community college education in California.

THE TEACHING FACULTIES

Junior College teachers have many characteristics which they share in common with those who teach in other institutions of higher education, but there are factors which set them apart from their peers. Among these latter factors are the conditions under which they teach, their educational qualifications, and the sources from which they come. In addition there are laws and traditions which influence the status and role of community college teachers. Among the major sources of data for this chapter are the recent Coordinating Council investigation of faculty opinion, the California State College at Los Angeles' study of new Junior College teachers, and Edinger's annual reports of newly employed Junior College teachers in California.

The public schools continue to provide most teachers for the two-year colleges, but decreasingly so. However, this last comment needs qualification since it would appear that in 1963 districts once again employed a higher percentage of new teachers from secondary schools. In the early years of Junior College education, classes were taught almost exclusively by secondary teachers. The ratio of teachers from this source,

however, has gradually dropped until by the five-year period ending in 1962 only about 30% of new teachers came directly from high schools or elementary schools. On the other hand, it appears that in 1962 over 40% of the new teachers were from public schools and in 1963 51% held secondary credentials. If this apparent change is true, it might reflect administrative concern about serving the majority of Junior College students who do not transfer to four-year colleges. From where, then, do the other faculty members come? Table 10 shows the approximate percentages from major sources as reported by the Coordinating Council.

TABLE 10

Institutions of Prior Appointment for California
Junior College 1957-58 to 1961-62

Source	Percentage
Four-year College & Universities	17%
Junior Colleges	12
Graduate Schools	22
Non-academic Fields	18
High Schools	28
No response/Others	6

It is interesting to note the large percentage of new Junior College teachers who are now coming directly from graduate schools. Intensive experience with teachers of this calibre suggest that they are and will make a significant contribution to Junior College education. Nevertheless, their interests are frequently devoted more to teaching transfer students of high ability than to teaching the more typical Junior College student. It will be necessary, then, for colleges to give more importance to in-service training of new teachers.

The Junior Colleges have increasingly attracted teachers who have earned or are working toward graduate degrees. Although the master's degree is now held by most teachers, the percentage holding doctorates is about 10% and seems to be leveling off at that figure. Of the approximately 860 degree holders employed in 1961-62, 161 held undergraduate degrees, 646 master's, and 53 doctorates. The 1963 data also suggest a decline in the percentage of new doctorates with only 5½% of the new teachers holding this degree. The question of academic rank poses a different status problem for Junior College teachers. Because of the close association of the Junior Colleges with secondary schools and the frequent over-lapping of faculties, no professorial ranks were, until recently, considered appropriate for the two-year colleges. The closer identification with higher education in recent years has resulted in more attention to the problems faced by Junior College teachers in relating to their peers in senior institutions. The issue of rank and its implications for Junior College objectives has been debated on the national scene and within local faculties. At present few colleges have instituted a system of professorial ranks, but those few who have -- all located in Southern California -- report general satisfaction with the change. Certainly the community college teacher needs status consistent with his academic preparation and importance as a teacher; nevertheless, there is some question as to whether professorial rank is the best way to achieve this objective. Those who say it is not, are concerned that

the university model may be destructive to community college objectives.

Certification is still required for Junior College teachers in California, although under certain conditions professional preparation may be deferred. There is, as yet, no general agreement as to the proper professional preparation of these teachers, and this is reflected in Table 11 which shows the certification of new teachers in 1961-62. As is typical of a majority of all Junior College teachers, a minority of these new faculty members have had professional studies which are specifically relevant to teaching in community colleges. Most administrators who employed these teachers, however, said that they preferred teachers with the Junior College credential.

TABLE 11
Credentials Earned by New Junior College
Teachers Employed in 1961-62

Credential	Number
Vocational	82
Special Secondary	74
General Secondary	378
Junior College	230
Provisional	102
Other	52

Preliminary findings from the Los Angeles study of new teachers in 1963 suggests that the model age is between 31 and 35, and that 72% of the new teachers are male. Fifty-five percent of them are 35 years of age or under. This means that on the average they are younger than Junior College teachers in general, but the sex ratio continues the great predominance of men over women on two-year college faculties. Socio-economic backgrounds of faculty members are only vaguely known, but approximately one-third of the new teachers report their fathers' occupation to be "professional or managerial". There is much evidence, nevertheless, that Junior College teachers do not represent the same social class background as the students they teach.

The California Junior Colleges continue to attract experienced teachers as is appropriate for institutions devoted exclusively to teaching. All studies of new teachers show that the vast majority of them have taught before coming to their new college. In 1961-62 approximately 55% of the new teachers had taught previously for 5 years or more. Only 13% had no former full-time teaching, although many of these had been practice teachers in a program leading to certification. There appears to be no increase in the number of teachers who bring four-year college experience to their Junior College assignment, nor is the number of new teachers from outside California increasing. In 1961-62 each of these groups made up about 15% of those with previous teaching experience. Edinger reported similar figures in 1957-58.

There is little information about the distribution of total Junior College teachers among the various subject fields. However, the five-year investigation by the Coordinating Council shows the following percentage distribution among seven broad classifications.

TABLE 12

Distribution of New Faculty by Instructional Areas in California Junior Colleges 1967-68 to 1961-62

Area	Per cent
Agricultural Science	1%
Biological Sciences	7
Math., Phys. Sci., & Engr.	19
Social Sciences	16
Humanities	26
Vocations	21
Educational Services	8
No Response	1

In 1963 the distribution was similar except for the large number of nursing instructors employed. They made up the fourth largest teaching field with 41 new instructors. English, as usual, made up the largest groups of teachers. To date there has been no general shortage of teachers for California's Junior Colleges, but there are several critical shortage fields. In 1961 administrators reported that recruiting was most difficult in the mathematics-science-engineering cluster, nursing, electronics, and women's physical education. Except for the last field, these shortages represent evidence of the expanding semi-professional programs at the community colleges.

The five-year study of new teachers indicates that the vast majority of these teachers (88%) are satisfied with their positions. All but 6% said that their job had turned out as they had expected. This apparent high level of satisfaction in Junior College teaching is supported by a more intensive study of similar faculties in the Florida system of Junior Colleges. Perhaps a more significant finding in California is that 83% of the sample were favorably impressed with their experiences as they related to major factors in choosing Junior College teaching in the first place. The rank order of the top four out of ten factors is: (1) Duties and Responsibilities, (2) Calibre of Associates, (3) Educational Philosophy of Department, and (4) Salary. These data would seem to support expert opinion over the years that few teachers leave the Junior College because of major dissatisfactions. The holding power of these institutions is great, as is their new potency in attracting potential teachers. Reports from graduate schools indicate increased interest in teaching at community colleges.

TEACHING CONDITIONS

With the growth and changing status of Junior Colleges have come several important changes in working conditions. In a number of aspects these conditions have become much more like those of other collegiate institutions than like those of the secondary schools which gave birth to the Junior College. The most important of these factors are discussed briefly in the light of recent data.

Although salaries in higher education still remain below those in comparable business and professional positions, the Junior Colleges have been successful in competing with other educational institutions. For example, the five-year study shows the median initial salary of

Junior College teachers to be nearly identical to that for all public institutions of higher education in California. This median salary was between \$6,500 and \$6,900. The salary schedules of the several colleges show considerable regional variation, and there is much competition among institutions of comparable size and wealth to stay abreast of one another. At present the top teaching salaries are pushing \$12,000 after 12 - 14 years of service, and almost all minimum salaries exceed the legally required minimum of \$5,000. On the other hand, Junior College teachers say that salary increase is the most important factor in making their colleges more satisfying places in which to teach. Of course, it will also be a major factor in the ability of Junior Colleges to attract competent teachers in the coming decade. The American Association of Junior Colleges has projected a national need of 100,000 teachers for the two-year colleges in the decade ending in 1970. It is likely, therefore, that salaries will continue to climb in the foreseeable future.

While salaries in the past decade moved quickly to competitive levels in higher education, the hours of instructional and non-instructional duties of Junior College teachers have changed more slowly from levels found in the secondary schools to those of collegiate institutions. There is, of course, variation in the teacher loads among the three segments which is the result of differentiation of functions. When compared with Junior Colleges, the relatively low mean loads at the State Colleges (approximately 12 teaching hours) might be explained as a consequence of upper division and graduate instruction; and the even lower teaching loads (6 - 8 hours) at the University as a consequence of these same factors plus research responsibilities of the faculties. The complexity of the Junior College program makes such averages difficult to determine. However, two-thirds of these colleges are using a 15 lecture hour base for determining loads. Only the small colleges exceed this average. From this base about half of the colleges use a 2 to 1 ratio in weighting laboratory hours, and another half use a ratio of $1\frac{1}{2}$ to 1. Furthermore, a complex of factors are involved in determining the loads for hours, number of preparations, number of courses, subject matter taught, classroom size, and non-teaching responsibilities.

Brief comments should be made about two of these variables. As was the intent of the 1961 Certification Law and the general orientation of those responsible for teaching assignments in Junior Colleges, few members of Junior College faculties now teach outside their major field of competence. Eighty-six percent of new teachers report this to be so. The second variable of concern is class size. By and large the Junior Colleges, by intent and philosophy, have actually built themselves a relatively rigid pattern. Because of convictions about small classes and close student-teacher relationships, few of the community colleges have facilities for large classes. As a result average class size for lecture type classes remain close to 30 and for laboratory classes around 25. Within these averages there are some variations due to subject fields, and a few new colleges have built lecture halls for moderately large numbers of students. It would appear that there has been inadequate experimentation in this matter of class size, particularly in

view of new methods of instruction. Certainly there is little evidence to support any dogmas in this matter.

THE PROBLEM OF CERTIFICATION

The celebrated "Licensing of Certificated Personnel Law of 1961" is now in operation. In spite of some excessive claims for its value to education and its disturbing attempts to define what is academic and what is not, the new law is an improvement over previous legislation. For the Junior Colleges, however, there is no significant change in the qualifications of teachers employed as a result of the law. One exception is the freedom for districts to appoint some teachers without professional preparation in education, but there has long been the use of provisional certification. It may also be true that more teachers are now teaching in their major fields at some of the smaller colleges than was true in the past.

Should certification be retained for Junior College teachers? This issue probably splits the Junior College family into two camps. Both administrators and teachers give arguments on both sides of this question. Since serious consideration was given in 1961 to the abolishment of certification of the two-year colleges it is likely that future sessions of the Legislature will be asked to decide this issue. There are a number of arguments on both sides:

For Certification:

- (1) The Junior College is a teaching institution, therefore it needs teachers with preparation in the art and science of teaching.
- (2) The Junior Colleges have students with problems of motivation, serious academic deficiencies, and special needs. Disciplined knowledge of these characteristics and ways of dealing with them must supplement academic training for teachers.
- (3) The uniqueness of the Junior College is not confined to its students. Graduate academic preparation alone does not give new teachers the understanding of commitment essential for faculty participation in curriculum development.

Against Certification:

- (1) As collegiate institutions the Junior Colleges cannot compete for teachers with other segments of higher education if they require additional work in professional education for employment.
- (2) Many traditional education courses are reported to be of little value and are rejected by those who have had to take them. It would be better, therefore, for the colleges to select teachers with excellent academic backgrounds and give them in-service experiences while on the job.

- (3) Teaching is essentially an art and can best be learned by teaching.

Several experiments are now under way in the use of internships for the preparation of Junior College teachers. Both Berkeley and UCLA have such programs--the former now in its sixth year. There is nearly full support from administrators and general support from the teaching faculties for this type of preparation whether or not certification is retained.

ADMINISTRATIVE PERSONNEL

Heavy responsibilities have been carried by Junior College administrators in recent years: the staggering number of students served; the selection, evaluation, and assistance to thousands of new teachers; the planning, building, financing, and managing of complex new campuses, are but a few of the areas of their responsibilities. The structuring of college administration, and the qualifications and preparation of administrative leaders have changed along with the institutions they serve. Who are these leaders, what are their qualifications, and how do they organize their management and leadership activities?

In spite of close cooperation and generally democratic procedures, there has developed a rather clear and characteristic structure for Junior College administration. Selection of the chief administrator--the superintendent or president--remains the most important task of the elected governing board. To him are delegated the responsibilities for advising trustees on policy and then carrying out such policy. Furthermore, the president represents the college in community, civic and many professional affairs. The chief administrator in turn, delegates specific responsibilities for the educational, service, and business programs to several levels of administrators. The most typical structure in contemporary Junior Colleges is for there to be a level of deans with major responsibility and authority in the three areas of the college program. Each of these deans may have one or more assistants. Finally, a very important sector of administrative activity is that of departmental or divisional chairmen. The relationships within this hierarchy are indeed complex and are becoming more so as a result of new faculty responsibilities in the area of policy information. Because of his essential leadership in this hierarchy, it seems important to report some contemporary data about Junior College presidents from an unpublished study done at Florida State University.

In California the presidents are recruited primarily from their own or other Junior Colleges. Of the 61 presidents studied 73.8% came from Junior College sources, 18% from the public schools, and only 8.2% from senior colleges. In this distribution California is unlike the other states because it has an extensive Junior College system from which it can draw administrative talent. These leaders also tend to be older than their peers across the country. The California average age is 51 compared to a national mean of 45 for all public Junior College presidents. In reference to highest degrees earned, the California leaders are better

qualified than their peers nationally. There are 60.6% of them who have doctorates, and all but one have graduate degrees. Nationally 54.9% of the presidents have had extensive experiences in teaching and in second-level administration. The most common position held prior to appointment as president is that of dean of instruction.

In recent years approximately 50 new administrators have been appointed annually in California, and this number is expected to grow rapidly with the expansion of present colleges and the building of new ones. Since the competition for educational leadership is now on a country-wide basis, it is important to look at the national demand for Junior College administrators. Projections in the Florida study indicate that the public two-year colleges of the country will need, in the next 15 years, 943 presidents, 1086 academic deans, 803 chief student personnel administrators, and 676 business managers. These projections are considered modest, but they are disturbing to those who are aware of the shortage leadership talent and the competition from other fields. It is likely that the demand will continue to exceed the supply and that a number of Junior Colleges may not have the quality of leadership needed. California may be more fortunate than some states because of the status of its Junior Colleges in higher education and generally competitive salaries. In 1963 salaries of presidents of independent Junior College districts in California ranged from \$15,000. to \$28,700; deans from \$9,900. to \$21,396.; and business managers from \$11,150. to \$21,396. Other states with generally lower salaries for college personnel than found in California are now offering competitive salaries for administrative leadership. In view of the demands and shortage of talent it is likely that administrative salaries will continue to increase.

The shortage of administrative talent was anticipated some years ago, and efforts are being made to identify, prepare, and up-grade Junior College leaders. Ten university centers are now in their fifth year of serving Junior College education under grants from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. California has three such Junior College leadership programs located at The University of California at Berkeley and Los Angeles, and Stanford University. Each of the centers have about 30 doctoral students, most of whom are considered to have the potential of becoming chief administrators in Junior Colleges. In addition, several hundred practicing administrators have already been trained by means of intensive summer workshops at the three universities. It should be noted, too, that these programs serve Junior Colleges in a number of other ways, through such activities as conferences for presidents, trustees, and other leaders in Junior College education. This new approach to the preparation of administrators is quite apart from certification requirements and programs offered at various graduate schools to meet these requirements. Of course, whether there should be certification at all for Junior College administrators is being seriously debated in California. This debate seems to have had some effect on the 1961 certification law. One consequence has been the reduction in the units of professional preparation required for either a supervision or an administrative credential. On the other hand, the new requirements for five years of previous teaching experience have prevented the appointment of young men

and women with leadership talent as well as the appointment of competent administrators from other fields. The changing demands for and roles of administrators in California Junior Colleges require a re-examination of the issues of certification and preparation.

JUNIOR COLLEGE SERVICE PERSONNEL

Because the community colleges place great emphasis on guidance and service of students, the availability and qualifications of those who fill these positions are important to Junior College education. It should be pointed out that some recent legislation has complicated the efforts to give maximum service to Junior College students. Regardless of its value, the recent "50 Percent Law," which required districts to appropriate no less than 50% of their current expenditures for teaching salaries, has had negative implications for student services. Under this legislation, for example, counselors and librarians are not considered part of the teaching faculty. It is likely that certain student personnel staffs and libraries are understaffed because of this provision. Furthermore, the certification law of 1961 carries even further the special preparation needed for guidance workers in Junior Colleges. The requirements are so extensive and at times so inappropriate that Junior Colleges find themselves unable or unwilling to employ professionally trained counselors. One consequence has been an increase in the ratio of student to counselor and the use of faculty advisors in place of professional counselors. The situation has now reached the point where administrators are demanding that the pupil personnel credential no longer be required for Junior College counselors.

There is general concern about the role of student personnel services in California Junior Colleges. Their importance to the entire enterprise of the comprehensive community college has been well documented, but the effectiveness of counseling, in particular, is being questioned. A number of efforts are being made to identify the problem and seek solutions. In California the chief student personnel administrators have begun a series of professional conferences and activities which seem to be making contributions toward the improvement of counseling and other services. Furthermore, the American Association of Junior Colleges, with support from the Carnegie Foundation, has under way a major investigation of the purposes of student personnel services, their effectiveness, and recommended changes. In general it seems important for all who are concerned with Junior College education to be sensitive to the importance of these services to community colleges as they become more closely associated with higher education.

THE PROBLEM OF STANDARDS

With the exception of three new Junior Colleges now in operation all Junior Colleges have been visited by accreditation teams and accredited under provisions of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. Accreditation of Junior Colleges in California began in 1953, following a long period of negotiations and discussions about its values to Junior College education. Under agreements reached in 1952 with the Western College Association, all Junior Colleges in California at that time were

automatically accredited. There was the provision, however, that in the subsequent five year period, each college would apply for a continuance of accreditation, and would be visited and evaluated. In 1962 the Western College Association was reorganized and is now known as the Western Association of Schools and Colleges. In its reorganization the Association retained the commission system first established for accrediting California Junior Colleges. The Commission presently consists of five persons appointed by the California Junior College Association; two appointed by the Accrediting Commission for Senior Colleges and Universities, and one person appointed by the State Department of Education. The standards and criteria for accreditation are established by the Commission, and they are intended to encourage self-examination by the colleges and evaluation of the colleges in light of their own objectives. Each Junior College is examined each five years by a team which includes representatives from the Junior Colleges, senior colleges, and the State Department of Education. Membership of the team is spread widely among Junior College personnel on the premise that participation in the evaluation is valuable for visitors as well as those visited. Studies by Johnson and others indicate that accreditation has been of value in the improvement of Junior College instruction and operation, and it has also had an important role in the community and professional image of California Junior Colleges.

Under provisions of the California Administrative Code (Section 131 (e) the Junior Colleges must have standards of scholarship for the continuance of students in college and for graduation. Minimum standards require that a student who failed to achieve a 1.5 grade point average (C-) at the end of any semester shall be placed on probation. Even prior to such regulations many Junior Colleges had established equal or higher scholarship requirements. A 1962-63 study of probation by the Bureau of Junior College Education is summarized in Table 13.

TABLE 13

Probation Standards of California Junior Colleges

Number of Colleges	% of Total	Grade Point Average or Less for Probation
2	2.7%	1.49 or less
28	36.0	1.5
4	5.5	1.6
9	12.0	1.75
25	35.0	2.0
1	1.3	2 times total units minus 10 or less
4	5.5	2 times total units minus 6 or less

Almost all colleges require student who are not high school graduates to be placed on probation at the time of entry. Furthermore, students from other colleges whose transcripts show a grade point average below the entering college's grade point average for probation are placed on probation at the entering college even though they were not on probation at their previous college. Most colleges require that students on probation who fall below the college's standards, while on probation for a

semester must remain out of school one semester. When they return, they are dismissed if they fall below standards set by the college.

There is grave need for intensive studies of students who withdraw from California Junior Colleges. Little is known about the factors which contribute to heavy mortality or what happens to students after dropping out. A recent Bureau study gives the following information:

A total of 34 colleges reported data for the total number of students who withdrew because of (1) grade point average (GPA) deficiency and (2) other reasons. The number of full-time students in this group of colleges was 81,571. The number of students withdrawing because of GPA deficiency was 11,130 (14%) and for other reasons 26,059 (32%).

The complexity of the problem of determining appropriate standards and some of the myths association with this task have been discussed earlier. The Junior Colleges have had particular problems in setting standards because of diverse programs which serve students of different abilities and interests. At their best the Junior Colleges have struggled to maintain the open door of opportunity while at the same time to preserve the standards of specific programs and courses - and of its certificates and degrees. Some colleges have faltered, perhaps, in this difficult job of confusing Junior College standards with those of the senior institutions. It is likely, however, that the general concern for standards and the temperate use of probation and dismissal systems will, in the long run, give substance to the open door concept. In brief, this concept means the right of young and mature adults to have access to post-high school education which is appropriate to their wide range of goals but which has standards requiring commensurate abilities and effort. The success or failure of Junior College leaders in solving this equation will determine who will be educated in California beyond the secondary schools.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION**

ERIC

**THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.**

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, THE CHURCHES AND SELF-RENEWAL

An Address By

John H. Porterfield

for

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND THE CHURCHES

"A Conference on Relationships"

Asilomar, Pacific Grove, California

February 17-18, 1966

ED016485

60 611 003

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, THE CHURCHES AND SELF-RENEWAL

The world scene is darkened with crises of gravest consequence, but the most obvious ones are not the most fundamental ones. It would be almost reassuring to be able to believe that the most profound problems facing the American people are those that have preoccupied our attention in recent years: managing our burgeoning, sprawling urban areas; retrieving a deteriorating, abused, polluted landscape; achieving honest equality of opportunity for all of our people; avoiding widespread technological unemployment; resolving the dilemma of Viet Nam; terminating a Cold War whose end we cannot yet even envisage; controlling a population explosion in the under-developed world that forebodes a catastrophic struggle between "have's" and "have not's"; achieving a world without war and thus removing that utterly terrifying sword of Damocles suspended over the entire planet--the hydrogen bomb. No sane man who is to any degree informed would question the gravity of these problems and the imperative urgency behind the drive for solutions.

But these problems, gravely critical as they are, have certain ameliorative features in common. They are tangible, they have identifiable historic antecedents, they are manifestly capable of solution if humanity has the will--and the good will--to find a solution. In many cases we are today debating simply the relative wisdom of alternative approaches that are already laid before us. Some European countries have already pointed the way for dealing with the threat of unmanageable cities; Americans have more than started on the long road to decent social justice; we can and will do something to avoid widespread unemployment; man knows what to do about the population explosion, and in many nations this is no longer a menace; and mankind certainly knows what to do to avoid nuclear annihilation. In that sense these concerns, though of enormous scope and importance, are not the most profound, most prediction-defying causes for deep disturbance. The question that should most disturb the sleep of thoughtful Americans--all Americans--is, "What is happening to us as people? What happens to the human spirit in a prolonged period of kaleidoscopic, revolutionary change? Is America viable? Is humanity viable? Can men find valid values? Does man have the will to resolve his problems rationally?"

Those who answer "No" are legion. Whole systems of psychological and philosophic thought, some of them widely popular, are very pessimistic about the future, not only of America, but of all mankind. And this pessimism springs, not from the insoluble enormity of the problems I first mentioned, but from doubt of man's ability and, more particularly, his willingness, to implement solutions. And so we are told that humanity is sick, incurably irrational, increasingly neurotic, and probably not worth saving anyway.

Almost by self selection I would think it unlikely that those who have chosen the ministry of junior college teaching as a vocation would share substantially in this deep pessimism. But we can all agree immediately that we are here dealing with the concern that underlies all other concerns: the state of the human soul, spirit, psyche, inner-self--call it what you will. And it is exactly within this frame of reverence that we are conferring here. Not that we have the temerity and presumption to take on this entire problem in all of its almost limitless dimensions. We have prescribed our boundaries much more realistically. We are thinking primarily of America, not of all humanity. We are presuming, not debating, certain human ends as worthy, and our discussion will center on means rather than on ultimate objectives. Those ultimate objectives, I take it, revolve around the concept of the truly free man. With slightly varying emphasis he has been described by Karen Horney in terms of self realization, Abram Maslow speaks of self actualization, in our reference book for this conference John Gardner emphasizes self renewal. These and many comparable expressions imply that the supreme good of which man is capable is the fullest possible realization of his distinctly human potentiality. And they further imply that that form of social organization is best which

best facilitates this realization.

These ends, I think, are accepted in this conference as being both attainable and given, and we are here inquiring into the means for their pursuit that may inhere in the sharing of resources by two societal institutions in California--the churches and the public junior colleges. Thus the subject of our consultation, though immeasurably profound in depth and implication, is manageably limited in scope. This inquiry is simply an opening up of what many of us hope will be a continuing exploration, particularly in local consultations, of the extent to which the purposes of the churches and the community colleges are sufficiently parallel to reward cooperative conference and action.

This sort of effort would have been unlikely and unpromising as recently as only a few decades ago. Only since then has a substantial part of the church in America embraced fully the conviction that its obligation to God is to be recognized and discharged by being a servant to man and society. And it is in these same years that higher education has begun so to redefine its purposes as to include serious and systematic attention to the developmental needs of all persons who can profit by any kind of formal education beyond high school. Another important change during these years has been the subduing of the harsh distinction that once separated the sacred from the secular in our culture. By acknowledging the conclusion that God is not exclusively interested in religion the churches have been able to involve themselves increasingly in humane enterprises without over-concern for the opprobrium of "worldliness". And we in the public schools are now able to accept and even to solicit the cooperation of the churches without comparable over-concern for the sectarian and imperialistic menace lurking behind the wall that separates church and state.

It is highly important to note, as we sit together to consider this crucial problem of human self-renewal, that of the major institutions of society, religion and education represent the only ones, organized on a community-wide and state-wide basis, that are centrally concerned about and at all well-equipped to deal with a matter of this sort. One would hardly expect a consultation of this nature to emanate from the central interests of the economy or of the military or of the government. The problem is vast, it is pressing, it is peculiarly our responsibility, and we may be derelict if we do not get at it. It is my conviction that our effectiveness will be much better assured by cooperative rather than by separate action.

And we launch this effort under conditions that are both propitious and critical: propitious because we could not well have done so a few years ago, and critical because both religion and higher education in our state and society are responding to the impact of major mid-twentieth century social changes that are already moving us in fundamental ways. As a school man I am better prepared to address myself to the state of affairs in the schools than to changes in the churches, but no observer of the current scene can be unaware of the significance for the Catholic community and for the world that inheres in the re-examination and restatement that characterized Vatican II. As for the ferment in the other major segment in the Christian church in America, Newsweek Magazine recently summarized it under the headline, "U. S. Protestantism: Time for a Second Reformation". Similar ferment has long been at work in the Jewish community. No one will deny that the institution of religion in Western civilization is undergoing thorough re-examination.

But let us look more particularly at the situation facing higher education in America. Here, too, social changes have enforced intensive re-examination of our goals and of our effectiveness in achieving them. One expression of this review is the recent and widely influential set of studies edited by Nevitt Sanford and published as The American College. Attention in this volume is directed to the prevailing conditions within the walls of higher learning and the extent to which

these conditions are functional or dysfunctional with reference to the purposes of our society. And the opening statement sets the tone for much of the volume.

"The trouble with students, so the saying goes, is that they grow up to be alumni", observes Sanford. "And indeed a close look at college educated people in America is enough to dispel any notion that our institutions of higher learning are doing a good job of liberal education".

And he later observes, "At the present time there seems to be an unhealthy alienation of the colleges and universities from the rest of society".

Such criticisms suggest the growing insistence, within and without the colleges, that higher education reassess its social obligations and its present fitness for discharging them.

The need for this reassessment is directly related to a number of sweeping social changes in this century, a few of which we will look at. The first is simply a matter of census statistics. In 1900 only one out of every three hundred and nineteen Americans was enrolled in a college of any kind. As we sit here today, one out of every thirty-six of our fellow citizens is enrolled in a college, trying his hand at higher education. The significance of this statistic reaches far beyond the problem it poses of teachers enough, buildings enough, and money enough. It means that higher education has long since ceased to be a private domain reserved for the social and intellectual elite preparing for the learned professions. It can almost be said that college today is the educational goal of all Americans. More than one out of every three persons of college age in this country is so enrolled and the percentage is rapidly rising. And who knows how many of the others are deterred only by lack of money and encouragement? May I make a brief reference to our experience at Diablo Valley College.

A year ago we asked the principal and counselors at a high school in a nearby community to select some seniors for an experiment. This community sees relatively few of its high school graduates go farther in school, and one of the criteria for selection of individuals was the unlikelihood of any attempt at higher education. Into a bus we loaded these twenty-five young people, all of whom disclaimed any college intentions, and brought them to visit the campus. They visited classes, talked with counselors, met with some of us instructors. Thus they came again and again one hour daily for a semester. Twenty of the twenty-five persevered, and their participation was, of course, purely voluntary. At the end of the visiting semester three of the twenty enrolled at other colleges and, so far as we know, are making normal progress. Seventeen enrolled with us, and with the exception of one who went to the Armed Forces, they appeared at the end of their first semester to be still with us and in normal status. Needless to say, an utterly amazed high school has picked another bus load of unlikely college material from its current senior class to see if this can happen twice. We don't know what proportion of our population can and will profit by education beyond high school. What we do know is that the supply of such education has never yet caught up with the need.

A second twentieth-century development that compels a reassessment in higher education is the spectacular explosion in the body of knowledge in the world. No area of knowledge is exempt, and our concept of the "reasonably well-educated man" has been radically revised as a consequence. Through most of the nineteenth century we were happy if most of our population had a good elementary education. In the first part of this century a good high school education was considered an adequate general goal. But when President Eisenhower in 1953 urged a fifth year of high school he was widely criticised as greatly underestimating the social need. We know today that fourteen years of schooling are none too many, even for only a very basic general education for everybody.

With this explosion has come a third factor, the revolution in technology. This is a change that can scarcely be realistically described except in almost incredible comparisons. All of the literature speaks of more radical change in the past fifty years than in the preceding two thousand. Richard Bellman tells us that it is technically feasible now for two per cent of the labor force to produce all of the goods and services desired by our society. Prime Minister Wilson is supported in his deduction that as many changes will occur in the next fifteen years as occurred in the preceding three hundred.

What all of this means for schools and churches and for all who have a humane interest in humanity is brought into focus by Alice Mary Hilton.

"Whether the gospel of 'progress' has made us richer is debatable," she observes, "but it is a fact that it has filled our homes with gadgets and our land with ugliness. And whereas it is a fact that it has prolonged our lifespan, there is also much evidence that it has made our lives empty."

Dr. Hilton directed these remarks to a conclave of churchmen. After presenting the true human function of technology as the release of man from drudgery, she concluded by a reference to St. Augustine's famous statement of the human goal. "The role of the church that you must determine, gentlemen," she said, "can only be one of several means by which you can help us to learn to love, and to do as we please".

And we will only add to Dr. Hilton's statement that the men who thus master their machinery will have been educated to that end.

Yet another modern condition forcing reappraisal in higher education is the unprecedented power concentration represented by Bigness: Big Business, Big Labor and, above all, Big Government. The present size, cost and pervasiveness of our federal government alone would have been inconceivable a few generations ago. With one out of every seventy-eight Americans today working as civilian employees of our government it is hard to believe that the proportion was once one out of fifteen hundred. It is even more difficult to believe that a government that now needs a yearly income of five hundred and sixty dollars per capita once required only two dollars and a half. Who can really envisage either the hugeness or the social impact of a Department of Defense that controls more land than the combined area of eight of our states, that employs directly or through contract ten per cent of our labor force, that controls assets three times the combined assets of our five largest corporations? This is government on the grand scale, and higher education in this country must reckon with the stark certainty that in a society where the people hope to retain control of such a leviathan the great bulk of the citizens--not just the leaders--must be appropriately educated well beyond the teen-age level.

But Bigness is a dominant characteristic today, not of government alone, but of all of our activity--economic, educational, even religious. And with Bigness has come specialization, depersonalization, dehumanization, and alienation. One hears serious question raised today as to whether "democracy" or "bureaucracy" is the more accurate word to use to describe our way of life. As John Gardner observes, "What is oppressing the individual is the very nature of modern society." In this vast and impersonal web of interrelationships in which we are all enmeshed, the worker sees little connection between his effort and his product and feels little identification with his employer; the voter feels futile and far removed from the centers of power in public policy formation; the student finds little basis for identification with the purposes, either of the course of study laid before him or of the institution in which he pursues it; and the young person finds so little to hold in common with the adult world that he openly proclaims his distrust of anyone over thirty. No institution is immune to this depersonalization. You will find it somewhat amusing and yet somehow a little disturbing when I tell you that a friend

of mine recently changed religious affiliation when her church began billing her for her pledge on an IBM card which she was instructed not to mutilate, fold, or bend. IBM seems well on its way to becoming a nationally recognized symbol.

Here is a prime opportunity for the exercise of the corrective and meliorative influence of higher education. But it is precisely at this point that the great bureaucratic multiversity, such a striking feature of higher education, dramatically fails. No one can hope to understand the great current wave of student protest in this nation, and particularly in this state, unless he assigns proper importance to this fact. In a recent analysis of the upheaval at Berkeley Joseph Katz and Nevitt Sanford described it as a revolution rather than a rebellion and attributed it, not to the ephemeral vagaries of "free speech" and other speech, but to institutional depersonalization; to work that is increasingly rigorous without being, to students, meaningful; to the anxieties and frustrations resulting from intense, impersonal and excessive academic pressures; to lack of a sense of community on campus; and to many other similar shortcomings in their academic environment. Concerning these students the authors observed:

"Those of us who have worked or talked with students in the movement find...that for all their apparent ferociousness and rebelliousness--and even the more extreme anarchism of some of them--underneath they are still reasonably pliable. Their search is for identity, meaning, community, and, by no means least, a response from the adult world."

The situation that these observers describe may represent the crucial challenge to colleges and universities today.

I have attempted here only a representative selection of some of the major social developments that are compelling higher education to engage in the most rigorous self-examination it has attempted in this century. Perhaps enough has been said to give an indication of these pressures.

Caught up in all this ferment, and to some extent a product of it, is the California Public Junior College--the newest, most flexible and, I will assert, the most promising of all of the segments of higher education in California. The idea did not originate in this state, but that idea has so flourished here that the junior college is widely regarded as California's outstanding contribution to American education. Today seventy-six of the fewer than five hundred public junior colleges in the nation are in our state, and more are being added yearly. They are located in almost every part of the state and are accessible to eighty per cent of our high school graduates. And they are patronized. Nearly three-fourths of all Californians enrolled in the first two years of colleges are in some junior college, and that percentage is constantly rising. The junior college--or, as it is being increasingly designated, the community college--is a major and critically important segment of public education in this state. This is the enterprise the schoolmen here today represent.

I have asserted that, particularly in reference to our concern for self-renewal, the community college holds outstanding promise for the future of our society. May I elaborate this statement. I am speaking, perhaps, of the ideal or model college and I will later refer to the problems and limitations that interfere with universal realization of that ideal. But the very existence of the ideal itself is important.

First of all community colleges are distinctly student-oriented, committed centrally to the development of the student as a whole person. The dissection of students into academic, vocational, and personal segments is philosophically proscribed. To that end adequate counseling is stressed which goes well beyond mere academic advising. Strong emphasis is placed on productive and reasonably intimate student-faculty relations. Classes are relatively small and the instructor loads are reasonable. Instructors are engaged and evaluated for their interest in students, and for their effectiveness in dealing with them, at least as insistently as for their competence in their subject fields. Instructors are hired to teach without any expectation that they will dilute their classroom effectiveness by engaging in

research. Co-curricular activities are stressed and realistic student self-government is encouraged. Faculty and student creativity is facilitated, encouraged, and rewarded. In all of its relations with students the community college is deeply concerned with maintaining conditions optimal for self-renewal.

In the second place the central instructional responsibility of the community college is for general education as contrasted, not with vocational education, but with specialized education. This is a great advantage, particularly in the light of the colleges' preoccupation with the student as a whole person. The colleges' concern is that the student shall be able to "see life steadily and see it whole". They leave the specialization to upper division and graduate work, while they try to concentrate attention on the comprehension of the interrelationship of all learning and the development of the effective disposition to evaluate all information critically. With Gardner, they believe that "education can lay a broad and firm base for a lifetime of learning and growth. The individual who begins with such a broad base will always have some capacity to function as a generalist, no matter how deeply he chooses to specialize".

Within a broad framework of common legal description and common purpose, the community college, as a third distinction, is characterized by considerable versatility and diversity. In the face of a growing tendency for all of the state colleges and the university to become more like each other, the sixty-six semi-autonomous community college districts have displayed generally commendable ingenuity in innovation and in adapting common purposes to local needs. In spite of some practical difficulties this situation creates at the state level (raising the pertinent question, "Who speaks for the community colleges?") this diversity has generally been beneficial and seems to be philosophically sound. Again to quote Gardner, "One of the most significant safeguards against monolithic integration is our tradition of the dispersal of power and restraints on power". The community colleges represent the outstanding manifestation of dispersal of power operative in California higher education today.

But of all of the distinguishing features of the California community colleges, the one most pertinent to our interest today is their openness to all who can profit from the instruction offered. An applicant need not even be a high school graduate if he is at least eighteen years of age. It is indeed the people's college. In a day when social mobility is conditioned more by education than by any other hurdle the community college is California's expression of the American dream--the conviction that achievement should be limited only by native capacity to learn.

Here indeed is a spectacle heartening to all who believe in human self-renewal. It is precisely the kind of provision Gardner must have had in mind when he wrote this trenchant paragraph:

"The society can do much to encourage such self-development. The most important thing it can do is to remove obstacles to fulfillment. This means doing away with gross inequalities of opportunity imposed on some of our citizens by race prejudice and economic hardship. And it means a continuous and effective "talent salvage" to assist young people to achieve the talent that is in them. The benefits are not only to the individual but to society. The renewing society must be continuously refreshed by a stream of new talent from all segments or strata of society. Nothing is more decisive for social renewal than the mobility of talent."

In California we have undergirded our democracy by drawing heavily on our wealth to erect seventy-six colleges; we have equipped them adequately--even superbly; we have assembled seventy-six good faculties; and we have placed all of this near the doorsteps of the great majority of our young people. We have said to these young people:

"This is for you. No consideration is given to your race, your religion, your social class, your economic status, even your past failures and difficulties in school. We offer you no easy path to higher learning, but if you are in some respects unprepared for what we have to offer, we will help you to prepare. If you are confused and uncertain about yourself and your future we offer you our counseling services and our exploratory opportunities. We offer all of this to you free because we believe in your capacity, because you cannot otherwise live fully, and because our society cannot achieve its potential unless you achieve yours. All we ask in return is that you take advantage of what we have to offer and put forth your best efforts."

This is the philosophy of the California community college. I announced at the outset that I might be painting a somewhat idealized picture. This may well be the case in part. But I want to add quickly that this picture was inspired not only by statutes and statements of philosophy, but by the living model of at least one community college that I know very well.

But all is not well with the community colleges. Problems which beset them are disturbing, even threatening. I will direct your attention today only to a few that most pertinently relate to the concern that has brought us together.

In spite of its history of half a century in this state, the community college is not well understood by most Californians. This is not so surprising when one remembers that most Californians are newcomers. But even among residents of long standing the community college is likely to be regarded as an inferior institution whose primary function is to groom second-rate students for entry into a "regular" college. This is a hardy error that no amount of contrary evidence seems to overwhelm.

Community colleges have not even been able to assure themselves of faculties that fully understand and subscribe to the philosophy I outlined. This unfortunate situation is traceable to many factors. Recent rapid expansion of faculties is one factor. The community college is in many respects a pioneer institution, and committed pioneers are not always easily come by. Nor have they yet succeeded in developing enough good training and induction programs to offset the quite irrelevant experience of the graduate school which naturally dominates the thinking and the expectations of the new teacher. Perhaps the clearer status associated with the traditional college "professor" is another factor. So both within and without the community colleges there is considerable failure fully to understand their truly distinctive character and to accord them the dignity and respect to which the high social significance of their mission entitles them.

Another development operating against the full realization of the "self-renewal" potential of community colleges is the apparently increasing general disposition to evaluate higher education in terms of its direct contribution to the security of the state. Financial and other encouragement is likely to be most readily available for those aspects of the curriculum that contribute most directly to some dramatically felt current national need. The needs of the individual seem increasingly likely to be relegated to a lower level of concern. It is sobering to reflect that this is precisely the attitude toward education that has always characterized totalitarian societies.

A problem that is creating grave concern in the community college movement today is that of governance. The diversity of which I spoke is threatened by a strong and often-expressed desire, particularly in Sacramento, for greater uniformity among community colleges. To many legislators and other influential leaders in policy formation it seems illogical to speak of a "system" of higher education when one segment is hardly a system at all, in the strict sense of the term. Strongly imbued with a sense of the value of diversity, community college people throughout the state naturally view this growing pressure with deep concern. And yet some way

of providing greater unity without fastening the crippling shackles of uniformity on the community colleges seems necessary and inevitable. It is a problem that relates quite clearly to their continued capacity to serve as agents of renewal.

Another aspect of the problem of uniformity is the difficulty caused by the disposition of many students, and to some extent by the other segments of higher education, to regard the community college simply as a convenient place to take the lower division courses that are introductory and often prerequisite to upper division majors. Characteristically today a transfer student will not bother to qualify for the Associate in Arts degree if doing so interferes at all with his working out of lower division requirements for the upper division of his choice. Community colleges are thus discouraged from experiments in general education that are more concerned with their contribution to self-renewal than with the readiness with which they serve the specific requirements for upper division standing. It is easy thus to foresee a development through which seventy-six community colleges become merely seventy-six lower division adjuncts to the state college or university system. To offset this possibility there is a growing sentiment in community college circles to ask that these colleges, which already enroll three-fourths of all lower division students, be given the responsibility for developing and defining general education programs and that the upper divisions build their offerings on these foundations. However this problem is resolved, its implications for the usefulness of community colleges as agents for renewal are obvious.

But of all problems facing the community colleges, the current and growing threat to the maintenance of the "open door" is the one that should be of most concern to us here today. By official mandate only the upper twelve and a half per cent of high school graduates are eligible to enter the University of California as freshmen and only the upper thirty-three and a third per cent are eligible for state colleges. For two-thirds of our high school graduates, then, the community college is the only available public pathway to achievement in higher education. Anyone at all familiar with education knows that a vast amount of valuable talent, eminently capable of achievement in higher education, lies buried in the two-thirds of high school graduates who have not yet been motivated to do superior work.

At the present time we simply have no predictors that will tell us with satisfactory accuracy who among this two-thirds of high school graduates (or other eighteen-year-olds) will later achieve and who won't. We can find out only by letting them try. This procedure has paid superb dividends in the past. Thousands of Californians are performing high-level tasks today and making high-level contributions only because the community college gave them a second chance.

But with unprecedented thousands of young people taxing our resources by seeking college entrance today an understandable, if misguided, support is developing for the idea that community colleges too must become more selective in their admission policies. Such support is obviously coming from interests that are always seeking to cut or halt taxes. But it is also coming from that segment of community college faculties that I referred to as never having fully subscribed to the community college philosophy. The aspects of this problem are manifold and complicated, but in this growing contest over the "open door" we see again how difficult it is for a society to remove barriers to self-renewal and to keep them removed.

These then are some of the colleges' pressing problems. The churches have their problems too, as they try to grapple with the multiplying needs of our hard-pressed society, particularly that segment of society which both the churches and the community colleges directly serve. Many of the churches' problems are strikingly similar to those of the colleges. Just as the community college finds it difficult to gain understanding of its mission and role because of the persistence of the old rigid image of the hierarchy in formal education, so the concept of "the church as servant" struggles to overcome adherence to a traditional image that severely limits its broader social usefulness. And, as in the case of the colleges, these conflicts and misunderstandings are internal as well as external.

The difficulties encountered by the colleges in attempting to maintain a truly "open door" are matched by parallel pressure for exclusiveness in the churches--certainly in some of them. And certainly all of the problems attending upon urbanization--transiency, uprootedness, rapid shifts in values, youth's difficulties in finding rewarding occupation, decline of intimate group contacts--these are problems that affect all metropolitan institutions--schools and churches alike.

But the condition that brings us most naturally together, it seems to me, is not the similarity of our problems but the parallelism of our goals. In our own eyes and in the thinking of most people the schools and the churches are the first major institutions that come to mind when moral questions, in the most deeply human sense of that term, are to be dealt with. Certainly in our concern for man as man--not as agent, not as tool, not as consumer--the community colleges should be able to turn to the churches immediately as ally, sympathetic friend, and mutual resource, in the words of William Laurie. And churches should be able to look to colleges. This is true in the large arena of social interaction and it is emphatically true in our own respective communities where our conference and cooperation can be most immediately useful to us and, much more importantly, to our communities.

And so our bond is deep concern for man himself--his essential dignity, his potential, his capacity for self-realization and self-renewal. I cannot improve on the statement of this joint concern that was made recently by Charles Collins, dean of instruction at Grossmont College:

"The common man has fundamental competence to learn to direct his own destiny. He is deserving of respect on the basis of this potential alone. It is quite possible that he may have a better head for wisdom than for detailed knowledge, for wisdom is probably as much a function of character as it is a complex of synapses within the cerebral cortex. For this reason great reliance on the inductive method may be misplaced. In the case of the common man the educative need may be more for extraction of basic principles and assistance in the integration of molar concepts. If, as Milton Mayer has suggested, the society faces not a crisis in knowledge but a crisis in morality, focus on the frontiers in knowledge for the few while the moral wisdom of the many goes undeveloped is not only absurd, but suicidal".

This excellent argument for the community college could have been presented as sincerely by a churchman as by a schoolman.

And so here we are, a group of churchmen and community college representatives, confronting a challenge that can be succinctly summarized. Our society is becoming aware of the fact that it faces a moral crisis--a crisis in values, in effective capacity for self-renewal. Of all of the organized institutions of society, none is more vitally concerned with this crisis than are the agencies of education and religion. There are over-riding reasons why religion and public education should continue to have separate identities and separate sources of control. But it also appears that there may be very good reason for the churches and the widespread community colleges in California to explore the possibility that their common interests and those of our society might be more effectively advanced if frequent dialog and consultation replaced totally independent action. All colleges have long carried on such productive conference with interested groups in labor, in business, in government--with almost all segments of the community that have some special or general interest in what the college is doing. It may well be questioned whether any such segment is more vitally concerned with the whole spectrum of the college program--with its broad social and humane concern for the student as a whole person in a society in need of constant renewal--than are the churches in our communities. And this possibility, as I see it, lays the central challenge before us today. Is this a possibility, actually capable of realization, and is it worth the effort?

And so we return to the beginning. If we decide that the possibility is real, that the effort is worth while, the effort will be our answer to the pessimists. In a very small, no doubt, but a significant way we will be contributing to the demonstration that humanity is viable, that men and societies are capable of self-renewal, that, in the words of Albert Camus, "The spirit matures."

In our endeavor to aid in that demonstration what man would not wish us well?

How we set about inaugurating this enterprise is, of course the second matter before us. One thinks of the possibility of a set of resolutions, widely published, to give the greatest possible currency to our concerns and hopes. We might wish to consider setting up some kind of structure to facilitate the coordination of our efforts and possibly the perpetration of this kind of conference. Specific problems may come to light in our present conference that even provide the agenda for the next one.

But, if the possibilities inherent in local consultation commend themselves to us as being real and worth the endeavor, the specific challenge to this conference is clear. We are to provide the spring board that will launch this enterprise in every community college constituency represented here today. There is no pre-planned or pre-tried pattern for such an attempt. We are indeed pioneering. And every worthy enterprise in existence was once in this stage. What is needed now is the vision, the enthusiasm and the determination that launches successful pioneering. To this end we are challenged by the deepest needs facing our fellow man in 1966.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

The Plenary Session

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Comments by
William N. Lovell
Associate General Director
Department of Higher Education
National Council of Churches

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE CHURCHES

"A Conference on Relationships"

Asilomar, Pacific Grove, California

February 17-18, 1966

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

DEC . 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

COMMENTS - by William N. Lovell

Together with Gordon Aumack and William Tarr I have sat in on a number of exciting discussions, this last day and a half, that bid well for the carrying on of similar dialogue-conversations in various parts of California. I think they can be helpful throughout the country in suggesting clues to new and beneficial relationships between community colleges and churches.

I will not try to report in any direct way on the several work-groups that I sat in on; in every case I was there for only part of the time, and fuller reports are being made by their own participants and leaders. However, there are two groups of comments that occur to me.

There seems to have been some perplexity in several of the groups regarding the stance of the church in relation to "moral and spiritual values." These were a part of many discussions, as one might expect, and they were discussed with many shades of meaning. Some people wondered why they were not more prominent in Bill Laurie's paper. Without fastening on him any responsibility for them, let me try to identify two or three assumptions which may not have been stated but I think were still important to Bill's paper.

The reason why many churchmen, both in pulpit and pew, have become reluctant to talk in a generalized way about moral and spiritual values is the belief that the church has become largely bankrupt so far as any special insight on these matters is concerned or any power

to implement them. There may very well be a crisis in morality, more so than in knowledge, as John Porterfield suggests, but much of what the church is expected to say, at any rate, has become irrelevant or marginal to the basic policy questions of our day, the ways decisions, either personal or public, are made and the way in which the tone of our society is set. By and large our local churches have become relegated to a place in family life, often only symbolic, and a world of privitism and friendly security, bringing with them into the cities and suburbs the value images of a rural or town culture, with a high premium placed upon individual, personal morality. The very smallness of so many Protestant churches reflects their helplessness in the face of the bigness of the forces that move this society around.

Even though we must be quite serious in seeking to understand the issues facing community colleges, and indeed other similar institutions in our society, I would say that the churches have a quite selfish interest in consultations of this sort, for they are important to the renewal of the church's own life. And because her renewal calls precisely for a discovery in new terms of the meaning of the gospel in the affairs of the contemporary world the church should be reluctant to talk about "moral and spiritual values," as if she (or anyone) had clear answers to bring.

This is not to say that moral and spiritual values are unimportant, but rather that it is our temptation as church people to regard them in the abstract or as absolutes, whereas in every age they need

to be translated and understood anew in terms of the actualities of the lives and structures of the time. Respect for the individual is a Judeo-Christian value as well as part of the "American way of life," but do we understand how the individual is shaped as well as mutilated, folded or bent by the structures of our society, including the educational institutions?

Secularization is a word that caused trouble in some of our discussions. Secularization (not "secularism," which makes a religion of anti-religion) means, among other things, that values are seen, embodied or represented in the "secular" actions of men and the structures of society - this age, the saeculum - and cannot be understood as absolutes applied from above or unrelated to the vocational and institutional processes we are all a part of. It means, also, of course, an affirmation of the basic goodness of creation and of the creative and dynamic forces in a society, and therefore calls for understanding enough both to support and to criticize them.

The churches, then, need to identify themselves with and participate in the formative movements and structures of the new world that is emerging, - in the areas of decision-making in government, business, labor, journalism, and mass communications, the movements of technology, urbanization, internationalization, civil rights and community redevelopment, and the sweeping changes in education. Our participation is, first of all, not with answers but with ears to listen so as to understand what is going on and to share in the emergence of positive meanings.

This conference can be a prototype of a kind of new interest and responsibility on the part of the churches with institutions of higher education, not for our own ministry as usually understood, but for the central purposes and functions of the institutions themselves. Most of us in the churches, lay and clergy, know nothing about the community colleges and yet there are vital questions being faced and tremendous potential. For our own renewal let us sit down and learn the terms and the areas in which decisions are being made, and, therefore, the values that are being weighed. Perhaps we can become intelligent and sensitive enough to make a contribution to the large issues which we face in common.

Much more briefly, my other comments bear on the way in which our conversations are carried on. Assuming that we are able to make serious headway in some explorations together, and that is certainly to be desired, I could see one or two problems arising. For one thing, the churchmen in such a dialogue could appear to be just dabbling. In order to be taken seriously by the community colleges, I would think that a few churchmen, whether in pulpit or pew, ought to get on the inside of some of the issues - some of the public, political problems, for example - and really stick with them. I was fascinated with some of the things I learned here today, but I could see that after two or three such information sessions representatives of the colleges might be ready to pick up their marbles and go home unless a few of us churchmen were prepared to give ourselves seriously to action and support. On the other hand, there will be value if a sizeable number

of churchmen simply become better informed and, therefore, a more intelligent public about the community colleges, in addition to those who become seriously involved.

Parenthetically, the dichotomy in our language here between community colleges and churches is to some degree surely a false one. Hopefully, the dialogue between "churchmen and community college representatives will be just as much a dialogue among churchmen who are within the colleges and within the minds of churchmen who are also schoolmen as between different sets of people, as if churchmen were only to be found within the four walls of church buildings.

Also, as we begin to talk about the issues facing community colleges, we may need to learn what are the larger questions into which an informed public can enter with some competence, or to which, again, the perspectives of churchmen might contribute. These need to be distinguished from the technical questions which can be dealt with only by schoolmen who bring their own expertise to bear. This is not always an easy distinction to make and it is a debatable matter that enters into the relation which every public school and indeed every public institution, from government on down, has with its community. For example, does not the choice between general education or vocational education in any emerging system of universal education beyond high school involve decisions which society itself ought to make, in as informed a manner as possible? The particular ways in which relative emphases are to be built into an educational

program, however, necessitate technical know-how.

A very probing discussion in one of the work-groups raised a doubt in any mind as to how far we could go in facing certain comprehensive questions such as the increase of leisure-time through technological unemployment, unless we involve other agencies in our communities who are equally concerned. And unless we have some experts with us, we could quickly find ourselves at a dead end. I may be quite wrong, but my hunch is that though many large questions such as this one impinge upon the work of community colleges, we will do better to stick close to the decisions which the colleges need to make on these matters. The conversation will be more disciplined and more fruitful. On the other hand, out of such discussions we may find ways to become allies, to use one of Bill Laurie's words, in facing issues that are important to the whole community.

With these few cautions now stated, there are surely a number of issues that would be both fascinating and fruitful to discuss together. Take the whole question of who is to be educated. If, in fact, the community college enterprise represents the beginning of universal higher education up through the 14th grade for every person who desires it, and, therefore, can be expected to reach many who are presently disadvantaged racially, culturally, and educationally, the churches ought to have antennae with which to understand and appreciate it. But I am not sure the churches are prepared to commit themselves to such a movement; they are likely,

again, to lag behind other forces for social change. The churches are caught somewhat in the middle on this score. The churches are under pressure to help in lifting up the academic standards of many church-related colleges which are shamefully low, and in other ways make respectable contributions to scholarship and intellectual inquiry. We have a guilty conscience in this regard, for piety has often crowded out sound learning. Overcoming our deficiencies in this respect, however, has something of an elitist motivation in it whereas an interest in what the community colleges stand for comes from a commitment to the welfare of all in society, even the least.

Who is to be educated, then, would be a provocative question to wrestle with. The next one, of course, how, is equally important for it raises such questions as the relation of general education to vocational education and the basic needs of individuals and society. The ways in which teaching and counseling are central to the community college process; how innovation can be brought about; and how the methods of good teaching and counseling can spread downward as well as upward in the school system would be worth exploring.

Another cluster of questions deals with the way in which the climate of the college and its educational process increase personal and social sensitivity, raise ultimate questions of existence, extend usefulness and a commitment to service. This is not to say that the college is to become a church, nor to under-estimate the particular role of local churches and voluntary religious groups within the

institution but rather to suggest that the college and all of its institutional procedures inevitably have an effect upon the attitudes and values of its students and faculty, and the quality of this effect is part of its social and educational responsibility.

Finally, perhaps some churchmen could become knowledgeable about the political problems a community college faces, and take part in determining the relationship between diversity and a degree of autonomous community responsibility and the coordination of community colleges in state-wide patterns of education.

I hope we as churches and as churchmen, both in pulpit and pew, can take the initiative in inviting community college leaders to take us inside some of their problems and hopes and needs. Let us hope, then, that the churches can become educated enough to render a degree of responsible service, and become in some measure allies, sympathetic friends and critics, and a helpful resource.